





607959

ACCOUNTS AND PAPERS:

FORTY-THREE VOLUMES.

— (20.) —

LAW AND CRIME.

Session

5 February — 13 August 1875.

VOL. LXI.

1875.

ACCOUNT AND JOURNAL

OF THE

(1801)

OF THE

Journal

OF THE

VOL. I.

ACCOUNTS AND PAPERS:

1875.

FORTY-THREE VOLUMES:—CONTENTS OF THE TWENTIETH VOLUME.

N.B.—*THE* Figures at the beginning of the line, correspond with the N^o at the foot of each Paper; and the Figures at the end of the line, refer to the MS. Paging of the Volumes arranged for *The House of Commons*.

LAW AND CRIME:

Agricultural Children Act:

- ✓ 448. Correspondence between the Home Office and Justices of Quarter Sessions relative to the operation of the Agricultural Children Act:—And, Instructions issued to the Police with regard to enforcing the said Act - - - - p. 1

Bankruptcy Act, 1869 :

- ✓ 272. General Report by the Comptroller in Bankruptcy for the Year 1874 - - 17

Brutal Assaults, &c. :

- ✓ [c. 1138.] Reports to the Secretary of State for the Home Department on the state of the Law relating to Brutal Assaults, &c. - - - - 29

Central Criminal Court (*Regina v. Hibbert*):

- ✓ 237. Copy of Shorthand Notes of the Evidence and Summing up of Baron Cleasby in the Case of *Regina v. Hibbert* and others, tried at the Old Bailey in May 1875 - - - - 203
- ✓ 273. Charge of the Recorder to the Grand Jury with reference to the above Case - - - - 223

Chandler, Sarah:

- ✓ 470. Correspondence relative to the case of Sarah Chandler - - - - 227

Circuits (England and Wales):

- ✓ 271. Return showing the Duration of the several Circuits in England and Wales, and Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes, 1873 to 1875 - - - - 235

Commission of the Peace in English Counties:

- ✓ 407. Return of the Number of Appointments to the Commission of the Peace in each County in England since the passing of the Act 34 Vict. c. 18:—And, of Persons who, but for that Statute, would have been Disqualified - - - - 241

Common Law Courts (*Nisi Prius* Sitzings):

- ✓ 65. Return for the Years ending 31st July 1872, 1873, and 1874, of Number of Causes entered for Trial in each of the Three Superior Courts of Common Law at the *Nisi Prius* Sitzings in London and Middlesex; Number Tried, Withdrawn, or otherwise disposed of, and Number made Remanets - - - - 243

Consolidation of Statutes :

- ✓ 157. Minutes and Memoranda of the Statute Law Committee on the Subject of Consolidation of the Statutes; with Correspondence consequent thereon - p. 247

County Courts :

- ✓ 138. Return from every County Court in England and Wales of the Total Number of Plaints, &c., entered in the Year 1874; distinguishing those not exceeding 20 £.; those above 20 £. and not exceeding 50 £.; and those by Agreement above 50 £. (in continuation of Paper, No. 117, of 1874) - - - 261
- ✓ 375. Return from every County Court for 1874, of the Number of Plaints Entered; Number of Persons Imprisoned, in Classes; and Number of Days during which each Person Imprisoned lay in Prison - - - 317

Contagious Diseases Acts :

- ✓ 97. Annual Report, for 1874, of Captain Harris, Assistant Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, on the operation of the Contagious Diseases Acts - - 337

Court of Chancery :

- ✓ 248. Account of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Court of Chancery from 1st September 1873 to 31st August 1874; with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon - - - 365

Courts of Justice (Salaries and Funds) :

- ✓ 344. Accounts of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Court of Chancery and of the Court of Bankruptcy, and the Deficit or Surplus of Receipts as compared with Expenditure, for the year ended 31st March 1875 - - - 377

Courts of Law (Permanent Appointments) :

- ✓ 288. Minute of the Board of Treasury issued in 1873, directing a Circular to be sent to the Judges and other Heads of the Administrative Departments of the Courts of Law, relative to Expediency of suspending any Permanent Appointment to Vacancies in their Gift - - - 383

Criminal Law Accounts :

- ✓ 112. Treasury Minute, dated 29th January 1875, on the subject of the Examination, prior to Repayment, of the Accounts of Costs incurred by Counties and Boroughs in England, in Prosecutions at Assizes and Sessions, and under the Summary Jurisdiction Act - - - 387

Imprisonment for Debt :

- ✓ 45. Return of the Names of Persons Imprisoned for Sums exceeding 50 £. each in 1873; Prisons in which Confined; Periods for which Imprisoned; and Names of the Judges - - - 393

Justices of the Peace :

- ✓ 388. Return giving the Names and Professions of all the Justices of the Peace in the various Boroughs and Cities in England and Wales, on 1st March 1875, with the Dates of their Appointments; and showing whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting, for a Year or upwards - - - 397

Licensing Act, 1874 (Populous Places) :

- ✓ 251. Return showing the Number of Places in respect of which Applications have been made to the Licensing Committees of Counties to declare such Places "Populous Places," under the Licensing Act, 1874; with the Result - 447

Lyell, Sir Charles :

- ✓ 298. Correspondence between the Lord Chancellor and the Coroner, relative to the Inquest held upon the Body of the late Sir Charles Lyell - - - 459

Naturalisation Certificates :

- ✓ 445. Return of Certificates of Naturalisation issued to Aliens by the Home Department, under Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 66, and Act 33 Vict. c. 14:—And, of the Names and Descriptions of all Aliens who, in each Year since 1871, have obtained from the Legislature Acts of Naturalisation, including the Right of Sitting in Parliament and being of Her Majesty's Privy Council (in continuation of Paper, No. 142, of 1872) - - - 467

Merthyr Tydvil (Preservation of the Peace):

- ✓ 115. Correspondence on the subject of calling an Additional Force of Police and a Military Force into the Merthyr District - - - - - p. 475

Offences Punishable by Flogging:

- ✓ 401. Return of the Number of Persons Convicted of Offences which under the Act 26 & 27 Vict. are punishable by Flogging at each Assize Town and Central Criminal Court since 1862; and Number Flogged - - - - - 479

Privy Council (Oath taken by the Clerk):

- ✓ 88. Copy of the Oath taken by the Clerk of Her Majesty's Privy Council on Appointment - - - - - 487

Prosecutions:

- ✓ 235. Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in England and Wales during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874, at Assizes; at Quarter Sessions; and in Summary Proceedings under the Criminal Justice and Juvenile Offenders Acts; showing the Total Number of Prosecutions of each Class; the Amounts Claimed from the Treasury in respect of the Prosecutions of each Class; and the Total Amount repaid by the Treasury in each Half Year; with a Statement of Disallowances made for the Years 1872 and 1873 - - - - - 489

Public Prosecutors Bill:

- ✓ [c. 1319]. Correspondence in 1872 and 1873, containing Suggestions made to the Home Department upon Bill (203), Sess. 1872, and Bill (173), Sess. 1873, for the Appointment of Public Prosecutors, &c. - - - - - 521

Superior Courts of Common Law, &c.:

- ✓ 343. Return of all Fees received in Stamps and Payments formerly charged on the Fee Fund Account, Superior Courts of Common Law; also, of all Receipts and Payments in the Courts of Probate and Divorce, High Court of Admiralty, and Land Registry, during 1873-74 and 1874-75 - - - - - 609

Temporary Laws:

- ✓ 309. Register of Temporary Laws, for the Second Session—21st Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland (38 & 39 Vict. 1875) - 615

Vaccination Act, 1867:

- ✓ 400. Return of the Number of Prosecutions in England and Wales, 1870 to 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," distinguishing those under Sections 29 and 31; stating, also, the Penalty Inflicted on Conviction; whether Imprisoned on Default; and, if Discharged, the grounds for such Discharge - 635

AGRICULTURAL CHILDREN ACT.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 6 August 1875;—for,

“COPIES of CORRESPONDENCE between the Home Office and Justices of Quarter Sessions relative to the OPERATION of the AGRICULTURAL CHILDREN ACT:”

“And, of INSTRUCTIONS issued to the POLICE of different COUNTIES with regard to enforcing the said Act.”

(38,913—16.)

CIRCULAR.

Sir,

Whitehall, March 1875.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State to transmit to you herewith a copy of the “Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873” (36 & 37 Vict. c. 67), and to request that you will favour him by calling the attention of the magistrates of the county of , at their next quarter sessions, to the subject of the working of the Act, and by inviting their observations and remarks thereon, and that you will be good enough to cause the same to be communicated to this department for the information of the Secretary of State.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

The Chairman of Quarter Sessions
for the County of

Henry Selwin Ibbetson.

Care of the Clerk of the Peace.

CHAPTER 67.

AN ACT to regulate the Employment of Children in Agriculture. [5th August 1873.]

WHEREAS it is expedient to make regulations with respect to the employment of children in the execution of various kinds of agricultural work, with a view to their better education:

Be it enacted by the Queen’s most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited for all purposes as “The Agricultural Children Act, 1873.” Short title.
2. This Act shall not extend to Scotland or Ireland. Extent of Act.
3. This Act shall not come into operation until the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five, which date is hereinafter referred to as the commencement of this Act. Commencement of Act.
4. The following words and expressions shall in this Act have the meanings hereby assigned to them, unless there is something in the context inconsistent with such meaning; that is to say:—
 - “Child” shall mean a child under twelve years of age:
 - “Certificated child” shall mean a child for whom a certificate has been obtained in accordance with the provisions of this Act:
 - “Parent” shall mean the parent, guardian, or person who is liable to maintain or has the actual custody or control over any child:
 - “School” shall mean a school which the Lords of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education have recognised as giving efficient elementary education; or if there is no school which has been so recognised within two miles, measured according to the nearest road, of the residence of any child, then with respect to such child any elementary school, and shall also include any school certified by the Local Government Board for pauper children under the Act of the Session of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth years of the reign of Her present Majesty,

chapter forty-three, and any workhouse or district school for paupers under the Poor Law Acts :

"School attendance" shall mean attendance at a morning or afternoon meeting of a school for the whole of the time during which instruction in secular subjects is given at such meeting :

"Employer" shall mean any person occupying not less than one acre of land :

"Agent" shall mean any person acting as bailiff or foreman or on behalf of any employer, including any person contracting for the execution of any kind of agricultural work on land in the occupation of any employer :

"Summary Jurisdiction Acts" shall mean the Act of the Session of the eleventh and twelfth years of the Reign of Her present Majesty, chapter forty-three, intituled "An Act to facilitate the performance of the duties of justices of the peace out of Sessions within England and Wales with respect to summary convictions and orders," and any Acts amending the same :

"Court of summary jurisdiction" shall mean any justice or justices of the peace, metropolitan police magistrate, stipendiary or other magistrate, or officer, by whatever name called, to whom jurisdiction is given by the Summary Jurisdiction Acts or any Acts therein referred to.

Prohibition of employment of children under eight years in agricultural work.

5. From and after the commencement of this Act it shall not be lawful for any employer or his agent to employ any child under the age of eight years in the execution of any kind of agricultural work, unless he be the parent of such child, and the child be so employed by him on land in his own occupation.

Restrictions on employment of children above eight years in agricultural work.

6. From and after the commencement of this Act it shall not be lawful, subject as hereinafter mentioned, for any employer or his agent to employ any child above the age of eight years in the execution of any kind of agricultural work, unless the parent of such child has obtained and exhibited to the employer or his agent a certificate in the form in the schedule to this Act annexed, or a form similar thereto, and stating the age of the child on his last birthday previous to the date of the issue of the certificate, and that the child has completed, if under ten years of age two hundred and fifty school attendances, and if ten years of age or upwards one hundred and fifty school attendances, within a period commencing not more than twelve months immediately preceding the month in which the certificate is issued. Such certificate shall not for the purposes of this Act be of any force or effect after the expiration of twelve months from the date of the issue thereof.

Certificate of school attendances to be given on application of parent.

7. The parent of any child above eight years of age may apply to the principal teacher for the time being of any school which such child has attended during the twelve months, or any part of the twelve months, immediately preceding the month in which the application is made, to furnish a certificate in the said form specifying the number of school attendances of such child ; and any such teacher, who without reasonable cause, makes default in complying with such application shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Power to suspend temporarily restrictive provisions of Act.

8. A court of summary jurisdiction in any petty sessional division may, if he thinks fit, upon the written application of any person or persons occupying in the aggregate not less than three hundred acres of land in such petty sessional division, issue a notice declaring the restrictions imposed by this Act on the employment of children to be suspended therein for the period to be named in such notice ; and during such period such restrictions shall not (save as to any proceedings commenced before the date of the notice) be of any force within such petty sessional division : Provided that the period or periods so named by any such court shall not exceed in the whole eight weeks between the first day of January and the thirty-first day of December in any year.

The court shall cause a copy of every notice so issued to be sent to the overseers of every parish within such petty sessional division, and the overseers shall affix the same to the door of the principal church in the parish ; and the court may further advertise any such notice in such manner (if any) as it may think fit.

Power of court to exempt from school attendances in case of illness, &c.

9. Where a court of summary jurisdiction are satisfied that a child has been prevented by illness or some reasonable cause from completing during any twelve months the number of school attendances requisite for obtaining a certificate in accordance with the provisions of this Act, such court may by order made in a summary manner exempt the child for the purposes of this Act from such number of school attendances as may be specified in the order, and a copy of such order shall be delivered gratis to the person applying for the same ; and such order shall have the same effect for the purposes of this Act as if it were a certificate that the child had completed the number of school attendances mentioned in such order.

Saving for children employed in harvest, or unable to attend school, or employed when school is closed.

10. Nothing in this Act shall render any employer or his agent liable to any penalty for employing any child above the age of eight years for whom no certificate has been obtained in accordance with the provisions of this Act in the operations of hay harvest, corn harvest, or the gathering of hops, nor shall any employer or his agent be liable to a penalty for employing any such child in the execution of other agricultural work, if it is proved to the satisfaction of the court having cognisance of the case either—

(a.) That during the twelve months immediately preceding the date of the employment there was no school open at which the child could have completed the number of school attendances requisite for obtaining a certificate in accordance with the provisions of this Act within two miles, measured according to the nearest road, of the residence of such child ; or

(b.) That

(b.) That the school habitually attended by the child was closed for the holidays or other temporary cause at the time of the employment.

11. The provisions of this Act with respect to the employment of children shall not apply in the case of any child who has obtained from one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, or from some person to be deputed by him for the purpose, a certificate under his hand to the effect that such child has reached the fourth standard of education as prescribed by the Minutes of the Education Department for the time being in force with respect to the Parliamentary Grant, or such other standard as may from time to time be fixed for the purpose of this Act by Minute of the Education Department; nor shall the said provisions apply in the case of any child for the time being detained in a certified reformatory school or in a certified industrial school within the meaning of the Reformatory Schools Acts, 1866 and 1872, and the Industrial Schools Acts, 1866 and 1872, respectively.

Cases in which provisions of Act shall not apply.

12. If any employer or his agent employs any child in contravention of any of the provisions of this Act he shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, unless it appears to the court having cognizance of the case that the child was so employed on the representation of his parent and under the belief in good faith that he was a duly certificated child, or above the age of twelve years, in which case the employer or agent shall not be, but the parent shall be, guilty of an offence against this Act.

Persons employing children in contravention of Act deemed guilty of offence against Act.

13. Every person who forges or counterfeits any certificate required by this Act, or give or signs any such certificate falsely, or wilfully makes use of any forged, counterfeited, or false certificate, or aids in or abets any of the foregoing offences, shall be liable to be imprisoned for any period not exceeding three months with or without hard labour.

Penalty for forging, &c., certificate.

14. Every person guilty of an offence against this Act for which no other punishment is imposed by this Act, shall be liable, if he be an employer or an agent to a penalty not exceeding five pounds, and if he be any other person to a penalty not exceeding one pound.

Penalty on offences against Act.

15. All offences against this Act, and all penalties under this Act, may be prosecuted and recovered in manner directed by the Summary Jurisdiction Acts, before a court of summary jurisdiction, which, when hearing and determining an information or complaint or any application under this Act, shall be constituted of two or more justices of the peace in petty sessions sitting at a place appointed for holding petty sessions, or of some magistrate or officer for the time being empowered by law to do alone any act authorised to be done by more than one justice of the peace sitting at some court or other place appointed for the administration of justice.

Summary proceedings for offences against Act.

16. So much of the fourth section of the Agricultural Gangs Act, 1867, as enacts that no child under the age of eight years shall be employed in any agricultural gang shall be and the same is hereby repealed; and in lieu thereof be it enacted, that no child under the age of ten years shall be employed in any agricultural gang.

Repeal of sect. 4. of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 130.

SCHEDULE.

FORM OF CERTIFICATE OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

I hereby certify that the subjoined particulars of date of admission to and number of attendances at School with reference to A. B. residing with C. D. at are correct.

Name of Child.	Date of Admission to this School.		Number of School Attendances within the Twelve Months ending
	Month.	Year.	

And I further certify, that to the best of my belief the age of the said A. B. on his last birthday was years.

(signed) M. N.,
Principal Teacher of School,
Dated of One thousand
Eight hundred and

Note.—All numbers in this form must be inserted in words and not in figures.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATIVE TO THE

Sir,

Shire Hall, Bedford, 15 April 1875.

I HAVE the honour to state in reply to your circular of the 29th ultimo, calling attention to the "Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," that by the direction of the quarter sessions of this county, notice has been published throughout this county of the provisions of the Act.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Theod Wm. Pearse.*

To Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson,
Baronet.

Sir,

Denford, Hungerford, 30 June 1875.

REFERRING to your letter of the 29th March last, on the "Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," I beg to inform you that the consideration thereof was, having been adjourned from the Easter sessions, taken by the magistrates of the county of Berks at their Midsummer sessions on the 28th instant, and that the magistrates then present were of opinion that the said Act is not working effectually, because there is no machinery for enforcing its provisions.

I am, &c.

(signed) *George C. Cherry.*

Presiding Chairman of Midsummer Quarter Sessions
for the county of Berks.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State,
Home Department.

Sir,

Aylesbury, 13 April 1875.

By direction of the court at the late quarter sessions, I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular letter of the 29th ultimo, addressed to the chairman, and I am to inform you that the same was brought under the consideration of the court, and a prolonged discussion ensued, and the court were unanimously of opinion that the Clauses 9 and 10 could not be effectually worked without considerable alteration.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Acton Tindal,*
Clerk of the Peace for Bucks.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State.

Sir,

7, St. James's-square, S.W.,
10 June 1875.

I HAVE the honour to inform you, in reference to your circular requesting information respecting the operation of the Act 36 & 37 Vict. c. 67, to regulate the employment of children in agriculture, that I brought the subject before the magistrates assembled at the last quarter sessions of the county of Chester, and the general feeling was that there were scarcely any children under the age of 12 employed. In one large union, the Chester, the guardians sent out circulars, and it was found only four under that age were employed in agriculture. I believe, from all the information I can procure, an inquiry in every union would produce similar results. I have therefore no suggestion to make on the subject.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Egerton of Tatton,*
Chairman of Quarter Sessions,
County of Chester.

The Under Secretary, Home Department,
&c. &c. &c.

DORSET.

Clerk of the Peace Office, Sherborne,
14 June 1875.

Sir,

IN reply to your letter of the 29th March last to the chairman of the quarter sessions of this county, with reference to the working of the "Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," and inviting observations from the magistrates thereon, I beg to say that the subject was brought before the court at the last sessions, but no magistrate has to this time sent to me any observations or remarks.

The Secretary of State,
Home Office, Whitehall.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Thomas Hooks.*

Clerk of the Peace Office, Chelmsford,
9 July 1875.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to inform you that your letter of the 29th March last, in which you called the attention of the magistrates of this county to the subject of the working of the "Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," and invited their observations and remarks thereon, was taken into consideration by the court at the last quarter session, and I was then requested to state that the court was unanimously of opinion that, owing to the absence of any enforcing authority, the Agricultural Children's Act is practically inoperative in this county, and that it is in their opinion essential that some public officers should be employed to enforce the Act.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State,
Home Department.

I am, &c.
(signed) *H. Gibson,*
Clerk of the Peace.

Clerk of the Peace Office, St. Albans, Herts,
10 April 1875.

Sir,

YOUR circular letter of the 29th March last, accompanying a copy of the "Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," was laid before the court of quarter sessions for this county on Thursday last; no instructions were, however, given to the clerk of the peace on the subject.

Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.,
&c. &c. &c.,
Whitehall.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Alfred Gill,*
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

"The Agricultural Children Act, 1873."

Stukeley Hall, Huntingdon,
20 April 1875.

Sir,

YOUR letter as to the operation of this Act was placed before the court of quarter sessions for this county at the Easter Sessions.

After some discussion I was requested, as chairman, to cause a copy of it to be sent to the chairman of each petty sessional division in the county, with a request that he would submit it to the magistrates of his bench, and ask their opinion thereon.

I beg now to enclose the answers I have received, which I enclose herewith. I regret I could not do so earlier, but I only received the last this morning.

The Under Secretary of State,
Home Department.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Philip Tillard.*

In reply to the inquiry made by the Secretary of State, with regard to the working of "The Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," the magistrates of the petty sessional division of Ramsey, in the county of Huntingdon, have to state that the Act is in a great measure inoperative in their division.

The magistrates are of opinion that some public officer should be appointed to inquire into cases of uncertificated children being employed, and report any such cases to the magistrates in petty sessions,

13 April 1875.

(signed) *Edw. Fellowes.*
Thos. Woodruff.
C. G. Hill.

St. Ives, Huntingdonshire,
19 April 1875.

THE Agricultural Children's Act (36 & 37 Vict. c. 67) is only partially enforced in this district, and being thus partial in its operation it is necessarily unjust in its action. It bears hardly upon the agricultural gang masters, they being compelled to observe the Act on pain of losing their licenses, whilst many around them are breaking the law with impunity and employing the very children whom the gang masters dare not employ. Only the other day a gang master asked this "bench" to allow him to employ boys required by this Act to attend school. He stated that such boys were employed by his neighbours to his manifest disadvantage. He was, of course, informed that if he broke the law he would lose his license.

The fact that this statute fails to indicate a person whose duty it shall be to enforce it acts very unfairly and exceptionally in the case of many village schools. We note also the strange anomaly that the children of paupers receive (under 36 & 37 Vict. c. 86) an education better, because more certain and for a longer term, than that accorded by the present Act to "agricultural children."

We would venture to suggest, as a temporary remedy, that officers should be appointed by the Education or other Department to enforce the Act. They should be furnished by the "teachers" of schools at short and regular intervals, with a list of children absent in breach of this Act. A single prosecution in a district would probably suffice for the enforcement of this Act.

(signed) *Arthur Sperling,*
Chairman, St. Ives Bench.
George Johnston.
Dennis Herbert.

My Dear Tillard,

Glatton, Peterborough, 13 April 1875.

I HAVE this day, at the petty sessions, held at Norman Cross, in the county of Huntingdon, read to the magistrates present, at your request, the copy of a letter from the Under Secretary of State addressed to you relative to the working of the Agricultural Children's Act of 1873, as well as yours in reference thereto.

They request me to forward you the result of their observations of the working of the Act in question, viz.:

In most instances the Act has largely increased the attendance of the children at the different schools. But there are some persons in parishes that come under our observation who do not strictly carry out the Act.

Philip Tillard, Esq.,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the county of
Huntingdon.

Very truly yours,
(signed) *Sherard.*

PETTY SESSIONAL DIVISION OF LEIGHTONSTONE, HUNTINGDONSHIRE,
10th April 1875.

Present :—Rev. P. P. Rooper, G. T. Bevan, and P. E. Tillard, Esquires.
“Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873.”

That the Act is now practically inoperative on account of the want of some official person to enforce the conditions of it.

(signed) P. P. Rooper,
Chairman.

“Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873” (36 & 37 Vict. c. 67).

Magistrates’ Room, St. Neots,
8 April 1875.

1. As magistrates sitting in petty sessions we know nothing of this Act, for neither has a summons been issued by us or has any complaint of its infringement been made before us.

2. We are aware that the Act in the Joseland Division of this county is not enforced, even in parishes with boards invested with compulsory powers to require children to attend school.

3. What seems to be much wanted is an inspector or informer, whose duty it should be to report the names of the farmers who, in so many instances, employ children without the required certificate.

4. To prevent an inconsistency and put agricultural children on the same footing as pauper children, it is desirable that Denison’s clause in the Elementary Education Act should be substituted for the provision regulating attendances in the Agricultural Act; thus requiring the same attendance in all children up to 13 years of age as a condition of employment.

5. We have confined ourselves at present to the above remarks, believing it to be desirable not to have recourse to compulsory measures till the present system has had a full trial.

(signed) W. W. W. Humbley,
Chairman.

Clerk of the Peace’s Office, Lancashire, Preston,
7 May 1875.

Sir,

WITH reference to your letter to the chairman of the quarter sessions for this county of the 29th March last, upon the subject of the working of the “Agricultural Children’s Act 1873,” we have the honour to enclose you, for the information of the Secretary of State, a copy of a resolution passed at the quarter sessions held at Lancaster for this county on the 5th April last. We have also the honour to state that your letter was also laid before the quarter sessions for this county held at Preston on the 7th April last, but that no observations or remarks were made thereon. We have further the honour to state that your letter was also laid before the court of quarter sessions for this county held at the assize courts, Manchester, on the 12th April last, and we enclose copy of resolution which was passed thereon; the same letter was also laid before the quarter sessions for this county held at Kirkdale on the 20th April last, when a resolution in similar terms to the one agreed upon at Manchester was passed by the court.

We have, &c.
(signed) Birchall, Wilson & Hulton,
Deputy Clerks of the Peace.

Sir Henry S. Ibbetson, Bart.

COUNTY OF LANCASTER.

At the general quarter session of the peace for the county palatine of Lancaster, held by adjournment at the Assize Courts, Manchester, on the 12th day of April 1875.

Present :—William Honsman Higgin, Esq., q.c., Chairman, &c., &c.

“*Re Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873.*”

Resolved,—That, while in the opinion of this court it is necessary that better provision be made for enforcing, by inspection or otherwise, the attendance of children at school under the “*Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873,*” it is desirable that the amount of school attendance required of children employed in agriculture should be assimilated more closely to that required of children employed under the *Factories and Workshops Acts.*

COUNTY OF LANCASTER.

At the general quarter session of the peace for the county palatine of Lancaster, held at Lancaster, in and for the said county, on the 5th day of April 1875.

Present :—Henry Garnett, Esq., Chairman, &c., &c.

“*Re Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873.*”

Resolved,—That in the opinion of this court it is most desirable that the same educational advantages and regulations which are afforded to children in manufacturing districts should be extended to children in the agricultural districts.

“*Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873.*”

Sir,

Boston, 16 April 1875.

IN reference to the favour of your communication of the 29th March last regarding the operation of this Act, I am directed by the adjourned court of quarter sessions at Spalding, yesterday, to transmit to you the accompanying copy resolution of the court, on the other half-sheet, in regard to the working of the Act up to the present time.

I have, &c.

(signed) *F. T. White,*

Clerk of the Peace, Holland.

To the Right Hon. R. Assheton Cross, M.P.,
Secretary of State for the Home Department,
Whitehall, London.

“*Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873.*”

In reply to the Secretary of State’s letter of inquiry of the 29th March last—

It is resolved that this court is of opinion that certain advantages have already been induced by the operation of the Act, as seen by the increased attendance of children at elementary schools, and the court is not aware of any hardship that has at present been experienced by the working of the Act. That the court is of opinion that the Act will in time be of great benefit to the country, but do not recommend at present a stringent enforcement of its provisions.

Sir,

Lincoln, 5 July 1875.

IN reply to your circular letter of the 29th March last, addressed to the chairman of quarter sessions for the parts of Lindsey, I am directed to inform you that reports from the several petty sessional divisions of the county, upon
the

the working of "The Agricultural Children's Act, 1873," were laid before the court of quarter sessions held on the 1st instant; and after a consideration of such reports I was directed to inform you that, within the division of Lindsey, there have been very few cases brought before the justices for infringement of the Act; that there is but little doubt there are frequent violations of the provisions of the Act, but that there appears to be an indisposition on the part of individuals to take proceedings against delinquents.

The court ordered that a notice of the provisions of the Act should be printed and circulated throughout the parts of Lindsey through the agency of the county police.

I have, &c.
signed *John Francis Burton,*
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

The Hon. Henry Selwin Ibbetson,
Whitehall, London.

Sessions House, Clerkenwell, E.C.,
5 May 1875.

Sir,

REFERRING to your circular letter of the 29th March, addressed to the chairman of quarter sessions for the county of Middlesex, relative to the Agricultural Children's Act, 1873, I beg to inform you, in reply, that your communication was laid before the justices at the county day holden on the 22nd ultimo, and that the justices have no observations or remarks to submit upon the working of the Act, since its provisions have application to only a very small portion of this metropolitan county.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Richd. Nicholson.*
Sir H. Selwin Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.,
Home Office, Whitehall.

The Shirehouse, Norwich,
17 April 1875.

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to enclose a copy of two resolutions passed by the court of quarter sessions for this county, held on the 8th April instant, upon a letter addressed to the chairman of the court by Mr. Under Secretary Ibbetson, dated the 29th March last, with reference to the working of the Agricultural Children's Act, 1873.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Charles Foster,*
Clerk of the Peace for the county of Norfolk.

The Right Hon. H. M. Principal Secretary of State
for the Home Department.

NORFOLK, to wit.

AT the general quarter session of the peace of Our Lady the Queen, holden by adjournment at the Castle of Norwich in the Shirehouse there, in the said county of Norfolk, for the same county, on Thursday the 8th day of April, in the 38th year of the reign of Our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year 1875, before Sir Willoughby Jones, Baronet, Robert Thornhagh Gurdon, Esquire, and others, their companions, justices of Our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace in the county aforesaid, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors within the same county committed. A letter addressed by Mr. Under Secretary Ibbetson to the chairman of the court, with regard to the working of the Agricultural Children's Act, 1873, having been read,—

Resolved,—That in the opinion of this court it is desirable that the said Act should be amended so that no child should be allowed to be employed in agricultural labour until he or she can read or write.

Resolved further that, in the opinion of this court, whether the Act be so amended or not, it is desirable that the Legislature should designate by statute the proper officer for laying informations for infringements of the Act.

By the Court,
(signed) *Charles Foster*,
Clerk of the Peace.

Sir, County Hall, Northampton, 15 May 1875.

I AM directed by the court of quarter sessions of the peace for this county to inform you that your letter of 29th March, relating to the 36 & 37 Vict. c. 67, was by the court at the April sessions referred to a committee of justices, with a request that they would report thereon to some adjourned court of quarter sessions.

At the adjourned sessions held to-day such committee reported that no proceedings had been taken at any petty sessions under the said Act in this county. The court ordered me at once to mention this to you. But such court made no observations or remarks on the Act itself.

I have, &c.
Henry Selwin Ibbetson, Esq., (signed) *H. P. Markham*.
Whitehall, London.

Dear Sir, 40, South-street.

THE enclosed are the only returns I have as yet received from any petty sessional divisions in Northumberland as to the working of the Agricultural Children's Act. They are all, as you will observe, very much alike.

Yours, &c.
(signed) *M. W. Ridley*.

COUNTY OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

AT the general quarter sessions of the peace of Our Lady the Queen, held at Morpeth, in and for the said county, on the 7th day of April, in the 38th year of the reign of Our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, before Her Majesty's justices of the peace, assigned to keep the peace in the said county, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors done and committed therein.

"Agricultural Children's Act."

The attention of the magistrates at these sessions having been called to the working of this Act by the Secretary of State,—It is ordered, that the clerk of the peace do send a copy of the Secretary of State's letter to the clerk of each petty sessional division, and requesting that the justices will give their opinion as to the working of the Act, and whether any proceedings had been taken under the same, and that the returns from the clerks be sent to Matthew White Ridley, Esq., M.P., No. 40, South-street, Park-lane, London, the chairman of this county, in order that he may confer with the Secretary of State thereon.

By the Court,
(signed) *Dickson*.

The bench of petty sessions for the north division of Coquetdale Ward, Northumberland, have not had before them any proceedings under the above Act, and the statute having only come into operation on the 1st January last, they are not in a position to give an opinion as to the operation of the enactments.

(signed) *R. W. Goodenough*,
Whittingham, 10 May 1875. Chairman.

"Agricultural Children's Act."

Sir,

Morpeth, 11 May.

I BEG to inform you that no proceedings have been taken under this Act in the Morpeth and Bedlington division of this county, and as yet the justices have not mentioned their opinion as to the working of the same.

I remain, &c.

Wm. Dickson, Esq.,
Clerk of the Peace, Alnwick.

(signed) *Chas. Hanson*,
Clerk to the Justices.

Dear Sir,

Hexham, 5 May 1875.

I HAVE to report to you that I have laid the order of sessions made on the 7th of April last, relating to the Agricultural Children's Act, before the justices acting for the divisions of Bellingham and Tindale Ward, at their respective petty sessions on the 24th ultimo and 4th instant, and I was directed to inform you that no proceedings have taken place under the Act.

No opinion was expressed by the courts as to the working of the Act.

Yours, &c.

Wm. Dickson, Esq.,
Clerk of the Peace, Alnwick.

(signed) *Richd. Gibson*,
Clerk to the Justices.

"Agricultural Children's Act."

Dear Sir,

Wooler, 2 June 1875.

I ENCLOSE report of justices for Glendale, pursuant to order of sessions. It ought probably to have been furnished before this. It was considered on 1st June instant.

Very few children are employed in this division under 14.

I am, &c.

M. W. Ridley, Esq., M.P.,
40, South-street, Park-lane, London.

(signed) *John Thompson*,
Clerk to Justices.

"Agricultural Children's Act, 1873."

Sir,

THE justices acting for Glendale Ward, in North Northumberland, have respectfully to inform you that every step has been taken by distributing abstracts and notices in the rural places and hamlets, with a view of calling attention to the provisions and enactments of the statute 36 & 37 Vict. c. 67.

There have been no proceedings against any employers of labour under Sections 12 or 14.

Few persons under the age of 13 or 14 are engaged in agricultural matters in Glendale. While the justices consider the various clauses of the statute useful and beneficial, their experience of the working of the Act is consequently very limited.

I have, &c.

Matthew W. Ridley, Esq., M.P.,
No. 40, South-street, Park-lane, London.

(signed) *John Thompson*,
Clerk to Justices.

Sir,

County Hall, Oxford, 27 April 1875.

I HAVE the honour to address you to state that your letter of the 29th ultimo, to the chairman of the quarter sessions of this county, was read to the court at the recent quarter sessions, when, it being thought that sufficient time could not be given to the Agricultural Children's Act at the sessions, a day was specially

cially appointed for the consideration of the subject, and I now enclose a copy of the resolution passed at the meeting.

I have, &c.
(signed) *John M. Davenport.*

To Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

COUNTY OF OXFORD.

"Agricultural Children's Act, 1873."

At a meeting at the County Hall (of which all the magistrates of the county had notice), on Saturday the 24th of April 1875, to consider the question of the working of the Agricultural Children's Act (36 & 37 Vict. c. 67), as invited by a letter from the Secretary of State, dated the 29th ultimo,—

Present :

Charles Edward Thornhill, Esq., Chairman,	The Rev. William Edward Dickson Carter,
Sir Henry William Dashwood, Bart.,	Captain John Augustus Fane,
Henry Norris, Esq.,	Major Edmund Ruck-Keene,
John Henry Ashhurst, Esq.,	Holford Cotton Risley, Esq.,
The Rev. Edward Fanshawe Glanville,	Edward Slater Harrison, Esq.,
Joseph John Henley, Esq.,	Henry Birch Reynardson, Esq., and The Rev. Robert Lowbridge Baker,

Letters were read from the following magistrates, who were unable to attend to-day :—

The High Sheriff (Mr. Harcourt),
Mr. Lane,
Mr. Barnett,
Mr. Wilson, and
The Reverend Thomas Curme.

After a discussion of the subject, the following resolution was passed, and it was ordered that a copy of it be transmitted to the Secretary of State :—

"That it has been made to appear to this meeting that, in various parts of the county, children of the prohibited age are, more or less, employed in agricultural labour, and that no instance has yet occurred of a prosecution for this breach of the law. And the meeting entertains the opinion that this failure to observe the provisions of the Act is due to the want of some special machinery for enforcing those provisions; but the magistrates present hesitate to express a direct opinion as to the agency to which the duty of inquiry or inspection and prosecution could most properly be assigned, although they desire to record that in their judgment the police ought not to be employed for the purposes in question.

"C. E. Thornhill, Chairman."

Sir,

Botley Court, Crewe, 10 April 1875.

I BEG leave to inform you that I read your letter of 29th March, referring to the Agricultural Children Act, 1873, to the magistrate assembled at the late Easter sessions for the county of Stafford. No observations or remarks were made thereon by any magistrate. I may say that on three different occasions I have, in my address to the grand jury, drawn the attention of that body to the statute, and notices have been printed and circulated through the country, setting forth the provisions of the statute.

As an individual opinion, I think I may further say that the statute will not have much effect in this county, as no children of eight years old have been employed in agricultural pursuits.

Children of that age are quite unfit for such employment in the district under my own immediate knowledge.

Few waggoners' boys are required, and until they attain the age of 10 or 12 years they are not equal to such employment; in fact, are useless. As soon as boys are capable of being employed in this district, the high rate of wages

in the collieries is a great attraction to them, and draws off a large number of boys from agricultural pursuits.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Thos. F. Twemlow,*
Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the
county of Stafford.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State,
Home Department.

Sir, East Sheen, Surrey, 16 June 1875.

In reply to your circular of the 29th March last, inviting observation and remarks from the magistrates of the county of Surrey upon the working of the Agricultural Children's Act, 1873, I beg to inform you that we had not at that time had sufficient experience of the mode in which the Act had been carried out to enable us off-hand to send you any information of a reliable character.

We have since addressed a series of questions to the managers of schools throughout the county (excluding the metropolis) and to others capable of informing us what appear to be the principal defects in the Act.

From some districts we learn that, limited as the operation of the Act has been, it entails considerable hardships upon parents, in depriving them of the earnings of their children; from some that the farmers find their work impeded by the difficulties thrown by the Act in the way of procuring juvenile labour, and from others we receive complaints that, whilst it interferes with the earnings of industrious children, it leaves unmolested the idle and good for nothing.

These, however, are evils inseparable from the Act, which must have been foreseen by the Legislature, and which its more strict enforcement will but aggravate; but by far the most general and best founded complaint is that the Act is virtually inoperative, very few certificates of attendance have been given or asked for, and no summonses appear to have been taken out for breaches of the Act.

This arises partly from its not being generally known, still more from its being no one's duty to see that its provisions are enforced.

Fatal to its efficacy as these two defects are, we hope partially to get over them by the free issuing of handbills calling attention to the terms of the Act, and by instructing the county constabulary to take proceedings where the Act is set at defiance in those parts of the county which are within their jurisdiction.

There are parts of the agricultural portions of the county within the metropolitan police districts. Here we are powerless to promote the observance of the Act, as the police, in compliance with your instruction, decline to take any proceedings.

In conclusion, I would point out that, however successfully the Act may be enforced, it will be of very limited operation in the county of Surrey, so large a portion of which is a suburban rather than of a rural character.

If compulsory education is to be promoted here, it must be by some other means than the "Agricultural Children's Act;" for, whilst the density of the population precludes the possibility of agricultural operation, and fosters a large class of idle children loafing about the streets, learning constantly all that is evil, and earning nothing towards their own support, the wealth of these districts is such that the voluntary schools are for the most part well maintained, school boards have consequently been found unnecessary, and there are neither Acts of Parliament nor bye-laws compelling the attendance of children at school.

If power could be granted to boards of guardians, or some other authority entirely independent of the managers of schools, to enforce the attendance of such children at some elementary school, the effects would be beneficial to a larger number of children than it can be hoped to reach by means of "The Agricultural Children's Act."

Far more good will be done by bringing compulsion to bear upon the many children, who are at once useless to their parents and baneful to themselves and

others, than upon the few children who are lending a hand, however humbly, in the bread winning for the family.

Yours, &c.

The Secretary of State,
Home Office.

(signed) *E. H. Leicester Penrhyn*,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Surrey.

Cherington, Shipston-on-Stour,

23 June 1875.

Sir,

IN reply to your circular letter of 29th March last, addressed to the chairman of quarter sessions, requesting information as to the working of the Agricultural Children's Act, 1873, and the opinion of the magistrates thereon, within the county of Warwick, I beg to state that I have communicated with the magistrates of the several petty sessional divisions of the county, and the general result of the inquiry, as far as answers have been returned, is that the provisions of the Act do not appear to be carried out, that no case in any instance has been brought before the magistrates to enforce the Act, and no opinion is expressed upon the expediency of the Act.

I have, &c.

(signed) *William Dickins*,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for
the county of Warwick.

Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson, Bart., M. P.,
Under Secretary of State, Whitehall.

Office of the Clerk of the Peace for Wilts,

Marlborough, 14 July 1875.

Sir,

YOUR circular relative to the Agricultural Children's Act, 1873, 36 & 37 Vict. c. 67, was brought before the last court of quarter sessions by the chairman, and some discussion arose upon the subject.

I was directed to inform you that no definite resolution was passed, but that the magistrates will continue to do their best towards carrying out the provisions of the Act.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Wm. C. Merriman*,
Clerk of the Peace for Wilts.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State,
Home Department, Whitehall, London.

"Agricultural Children's Act, 1873."

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Beverley,

9 April 1875.

Sir,

I BEG leave to inform you that your letter of the 29th ultimo, addressed to the chairman of the quarter sessions for the East Riding of Yorkshire, was this day laid before the court in sessions assembled, when I was desired by the justices to state that the Act having only been in operation for so short a time, they are unable as yet to express any opinion as to its working.

I have, &c.

(signed) *George Leeman*,
Clerk of the Peace.

H. S. Ibbetson, Esq.,
Home Office, Whitehall, London.

Sir,

Carnarvon, 13 April 1875.

REFERRING to your communication on the subject of the working of the Agricultural Children's Act, 36 & 37 Vict. c. 67, which was brought under the notice of the magistrates assembled at the quarter sessions held here on the 8th instant, I am directed by them to inform you, in reply, that in consequence

of the small extent to which children are employed in agriculture in this county, no experience has, as yet, been obtained of the working of the Act.

I have, &c.
(signed) *W. T. Poole,*

Clerk of the Peace for the
county of Carnarvon.

To the Right Hon. the Secretary of State,
Home Department, Whitehall, London.

“Agricultural Children’s Act, 1873.”

Sir,

Cardiff, 15 April 1875.

YOUR circular was laid before our quarter sessions on the 5th instant, and I am directed, in reply, to state that the provisions of the statute have so recently come into operation, that no information has been given the court relating thereto.

Application will be made to the several petty sessions of the county with reference thereto.

I am, &c.
(signed) *Thomas Dalton,*

Clerk of the Peace.

The Right Hon. the Secretary of State,
Home Department, London.

N.B.—No instructions were issued to the police of different counties with regard to enforcing the said Act.

AGRICULTURAL CHILDREN ACT.

COPIES of CORRESPONDENCE between the Home Office and Justices of Quarter Sessions relative to the OPERATION of the AGRICULTURAL CHILDREN ACT; and, of INSTRUCTIONS issued to the POLICE of different Counties with regard to enforcing the said Act.

(*Mr. J. G. Tubb.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
13 August 1875.*

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869.

GENERAL REPORT
BY THE
COMPTROLLER IN BANKRUPTCY,
For the Year ending 31st December 1874.

Court of Bankruptcy, Basinghall-street, London,
My Lord, 17 June 1875.
I HAVE the honour to submit my Fifth Annual Report, in pursuance of
Section 115 of "The Bankruptcy Act, 1869."

The results of the year 1874 are generally similar to those of the preceding
year.

The number of bankruptcies during the year 1874 shows a slight increase on
the preceding year, as against a similar decrease in the year 1873.

The number of liquidations by arrangement and compositions with creditors,
and the total liabilities of estates administered under the several provisions of
the Act, again show an increase on the previous year, as appears by the fol-
lowing Table :—

YEARS.	Bankruptcies.	Liquidations by Arrangement.	Compositions.	TOTAL.	Total Liabilities.
1873	915	4,152	2,422	7,489	£. 19,184,812
1874	930	4,440	2,549	7,919	20,136,670
Increase in 1874	15	288	127	430	951,858

Although the total liabilities in 1874 show an increase of 951,858 *l.* over the
previous year, the assets show a decrease of over 500,000 *l.*

The total number of estates administered under the several provisions of the
Act has increased 58 per cent. in 1874, as compared with 1870; the numbers
being 5,002 in 1870, and 7,919 in 1874.

The number of discharges granted to bankrupts during the year 1874 was
82, as compared with 73 in the year 1873.

Of this number 4 only as against 10 in 1873 were granted on the ground
that the bankrupts had, or might have, paid 10*s.* in the pound, the remainder,
78, having been granted on special resolutions of creditors that the bankruptcy,
or the failure to pay 10*s.* in the pound, had arisen from circumstances for
which the bankrupt could not justly be held responsible.

The number of cases pending in the London Bankruptcy Court on the 31st
December 1874 was 1,058, being an increase of 138 on the number pending
on the 31st December 1873.

Against this increase there was, however, a decrease of 33 in the number of
cases pending in the several county courts, leaving a net increase of pending
estates of 105.

The total number of estates pending on the 31st December 1874 was 2,924, of which—

460	were adjudications of the year -	-	-	-	1870
507	"	"	"	"	1871
485	"	"	"	"	1872
639	"	"	"	"	1873
833	"	"	"	"	1874

670 bankruptcies were closed during the year 1874, in 329 of which dividends were paid, in 118 no assets whatever were realised, and in 223 the assets, averaging about 77% in each case, were absorbed in costs.

The average cost of realising and distributing the bankrupts' estates closed during the year amounted to 36·39 per cent. of the assets realised (of which 19·72 per cent. was law costs, including stamp duty), as against 30·33 per cent. in the cases closed in 1873.

This apparent increase in the cost of realisation is, however, chiefly attributable to the inferior character of the estates closed, the number of estates with assets exceeding 2,000*l.* closed in 1873, having been 13 or 2·97 per cent. of the total number closed with assets (437), as against 10 or 1·81 per cent. of the total (552), in 1874.

The number of Reports made by me to the courts on the conduct of trustees during the year 1874 was 562.

In 320 of these cases the trustees complied before the hearing of the summons.

In 174 cases orders were made against the trustees.

In 50 cases the trustees were not served, chiefly in consequence of their having removed or absconded.

In four cases the trustees have been removed from their office. In one case no order was made, and 13 cases are still pending.

Of the increase in the number of compositions registered in 1874 (127), 75 are at rates not exceeding 1*s.* in the pound, the total increase being confined to rates not exceeding 7*s.* 6*d.* in the pound.

The per-centage of compositions exceeding 7*s.* 6*d.* in the pound has declined from 34·77 per cent. of the total number in the year 1870 to 16·05 per cent. of the total number registered in the year 1874, as shown by the following Table:—

YEAR.	Number of Compositions Registered.	Number exceeding 7 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> in the <i>£.</i>	Per-centage exceeding 7 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> in the <i>£.</i>
1870	1,616	562	34·77
1874	2,549	409	16·05

I append Tables showing the business done during the year ending 31st December 1874.

I have, &c.

To the Right Hon. (signed) *Mansfield Parkyns*,
The Lord High Chancellor. The Comptroller in Bankruptcy.

APPENDIX.

Table:	Page.
1.—Proceedings before Adjudication of Bankruptcy - - - - -	4
2.—Adjudications - - - - -	4
3.—Proceedings at First Meetings of Creditors to appoint Trustees and Committees of Inspection - - - - -	4
4.—Discharges granted during the Year - - - - -	5
5.—Bankruptcies dealt with during the Year - - - - -	5
6.—Bankrupts' Liabilities and Assets - - - - -	5
7.—Results of Estates closed during the Year - - - - -	6
8.—Liquidations by Arrangement - - - - -	8
9.—Compositions with Creditors - - - - -	8
10.—Summary of Liabilities and Assets in Bankruptcies, Liquidations by Arrangement, and Compositions with Creditors - - - - -	9
11.—Appeals presented to the Court of Appeal in Chancery, and to the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy - - - - -	9
12.—Summary of Bills Taxed by the Taxing Master and Registrars during the Year -	10

APPENDIX.

TABLE 1.
BANKRUPTCY.

PROCEEDINGS before Adjudication of Bankruptcy.

	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.
Debtors' summons issued - - - - -	1,883	1,731	3,564
Declarations of inability filed by debtors - - - - -	47	137	184
Petitions for adjudications filed - - - - -	569	903	1,472

TABLE 2.
ADJUDICATIONS.

	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.
Number of Debtors adjudicated Bankrupt—			
On debtors' summons - - - - -	149	178	327
On declarations of inability - - - - -	37	104	141
On petitions for liquidation, and failure of proceedings thereunder - - - - -	47	138	185
On other acts of Bankruptcy - - - - -	41	236	277
TOTAL Adjudications - - - - -	274	656	930
Traders - - - - -	183	558	741
Non-traders - - - - -	91	98	189
	274	656	930

TABLE 3.

PROCEEDINGS at First Meetings of Creditors to appoint Trustees and Committees of Inspection.

	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.
TRUSTEES appointed with Committees of Inspection - - -	221	362	583
Without Committees of Inspection - - - - -	6	248	254
TOTAL Trustees appointed by Creditors - - - - -	227	610	837
TRUSTEES not being appointed (Section 84):			
Bankruptcies carried on by Registrars as Trustees - - -	15	15	30
Bankruptcies annulled - - - - -	11	18	29
TOTAL Meetings - - - - -	253	643	896

TABLE 4.

DISCHARGES Granted.

	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.
DISCHARGES granted where 10 s. in the £ had or might have been paid - - - - -	-	4	4
On resolution of creditors, where dividend of less than 10 s. in the £ paid - - -	13	65	78
TOTAL Discharges Granted - - -	13	69	82
Suspended - - - - -	—	—	—
Withheld - - - - -	—	—	—
TOTAL Applications for Discharge -	13	69	82

TABLE 5.

BANKRUPTCIES dealt with during the Year.

	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.
PENDING 1st January 1874 - - -	-	-	920	1,899	2,819
Adjudicated in 1874 - - -	274	656			
Subtract, Transfers from - - -	2	25			
	272	631			
Add, Transfers to - - -	25	2			
			297	633	930
			1,217	2,532	3,749
ANNULLED on acceptance of composition or scheme of settlement - - - - -			30	63	93
By reason of no trustee having been appointed (section 84) - - - - -			11	18	29
On appeal - - - - -			5	1	6
For other reasons - - - - -			18	9	27
TOTAL Annulled in 1874 - - -			64	91	155
CLOSED after payment of dividend - - - - -			37	292	329
Without dividend - - - - -			58	283	341
			159	666	825
PENDING 1st January 1875 - - - - -			1,058	1,866	2,924
			1,217	2,532	3,749

TABLE 6.

BANKRUPTS' LIABILITIES and ASSETS.

	London Bankruptcy Court.		County Courts.		TOTAL.	
LIABILITIES as stated by Bankrupts, or where no Statements of Affairs filed as estimated by Trustees -	£.	s. d.	£.	s. d.	£.	s. d.
	1,891,041	—	1,897,598	—	3,788,639	—
ASSETS as estimated by Trustees -	187,528	—	297,917	—	485,445	—

TABLE 7. - - - - -

RESULTS of 670 Estates closed during the Year. - - - - -

Number of Estates.	Liabilities.*	Gross Receipts.	Extraordinary Payments in carrying on Business, Completing Contracts.	Payments in full to Secured or Preferential Creditors.	Assets.	COSTS OF			
						Law Costs including Stamp Duty.	Per Cent. of Assets.	Receiver, Manager, or Trustee.	Per Cent. of Assets.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		£. s. d.	
329	621,449 5 7	198,208 - 3	9,944 14 2	19,195 10 4	169,062 15 9	25,722 9 5	15.21	14,438 11 6	8.54
223	351,274 17 6	24,523 7 2	1,925 12 9	5,374 6 11	17,223 7 6	10,996 4 7	63.85	3,308 9	19.21
118	220,475 4 3	No Receipts.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
670	1,193,199 7 4	222,726 7 5	11,870 6 11	24,569 17 3	186,286 3 3	36,718 14 -	19.72	17,747 - 6	9.53

* The liabilities above stated are, in the estates which paid dividends, the amounts proved against those estates. In

ANALYSIS of the above, showing the Average Assets and Costs, of several Classes of Estates,

Number of Estates.	Class.	Average.			NUMBER OF ESTATES AT											
		Assets.	Costs.	Per Cent. of Assets.	Note.—The Numbers given under the several Headings include all Estates in figure; thus, under the Heading 10 per cent., are given all Estates											
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.		Under 2½ p.cent.	5 p.cent.	10 p.cent.	15 p.cent.	20 p.cent.	25 p.cent.	30 p.cent.	35 p.cent.	40 p.cent.	45 p.cent.	50 p.cent.	
116	Under £. 50	23 11 5	23 11 5	100	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	
100	£. 50 to £. 100	74 2 5	65 16 8	88.82	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	
61	100 „ 150	124 17 5	96 13 5	77.41	—	—	—	—	1	—	11	—	3	2	4	
57	150 „ 200	173 3 8	101 16 11	58.80	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	4	5	4	8	
38	200 „ 250	222 19 3	106 18 -	47.95	—	—	—	—	2	4	4	2	5	4	3	
29	250 „ 300	276 7 4	141 6 8	51.13	1	—	2	1	—	2	3	1	2	4	3	
24	300 „ 350	322 4 6	164 7 11	51.02	1	—	—	—	1	1	2	1	3	1	3	
13	350 „ 400	376 9 6	172 6 6	45.78	—	—	—	—	1	2	2	1	1	1	—	
26	400 „ 500	459 8 -	212 16 4	46.32	—	—	1	1	2	1	4	3	2	2	3	
15	500 „ 600	544 8 7	248 12 2	45.66	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	2	3	2	1	
16	600 „ 700	650 9 7	251 11 4	38.67	—	—	—	1	—	3	5	2	1	—	1	
9	700 „ 800	737 13 7	178 - 2	24.12	—	—	2	1	2	—	2	1	—	—	—	
10	800 „ 1,000	897 9 5	237 5 10	26.43	—	—	1	2	2	2	1	1	—	—	—	
15	1,000 „ 1,200	1,057 4 3	309 16 9	29.30	—	—	—	3	2	—	4	2	3	1	—	
9	1,200 „ 1,500	1,381 14 3	322 14 6	23.36	—	—	—	4	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	
4	1,500 „ 2,000	1,660 12 2	342 1 6	20.60	—	—	—	2	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	
4	2,000 „ 3,000	2,596 8 8	560 1 -	21.57	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
2	3,000 „ 4,000	3,991 5 3	439 13 2	11.01	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
1	4,000 „ 5,000	4,747 14 2	1,075 19 10	22.66	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	
1	5,000 „ 6,000	5,353 14 7	312 1 8	5.83	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
1	6,000 „ 7,000	6,008 15 10	985 15 -	16.39	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
1	10,000 „ 20,000	13,987 - 5	304 2 6	2.20	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
552					*3	1	8	19	19	20	33	21	28	22	30	
118	No Receipts.															
670																

* In these cases the whole of the Costs does not appear in the Trustees' Accounts, a portion having been paid

TABLE 7.

RESULTS of 670 Estates closed during the Year.

REALISATION AND DISTRIBUTION.						Allowed to Bankrupt.	Per Cent. of Assets.	Dividends Declared.	Per Cent. of Assets.	Balance.	Per Cent. of Assets.
Auctioneer, Accountant, &c.	Per Cent. of Assets.	Incidental.	Per Cent. of Assets.	TOTAL.	Per Cent. of Assets.						
£. s. d.		£. s. d.		£. s. d.		£. s. d.		£. s. d.		£. s. d.	
4,292 1 10	2·54	5,918 11 11	3·51	50,371 14 8	29·80	5,099 1 2	3·02	112,174 12 3	66·35	1,417 7 8 in hand.	0·83
1,598 17 3	9·28	1,488 16 1	8·64	17,392 6 11	100·98	242 1 4	1·40	—	—	411 — 9 due to Trustees.	2·38
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5,890 19 1	3·16	7,407 8 —	3·98	67,764 1 7	36·39	5,341 2 6	2·86	112,174 12 3	60·22	1,006 6 11	0·53

the other cases, they are the amounts stated by Bankrupts, or roughly estimated where no statements have been filed.

with the Number of Estates at several Rates of Cost, and the Rates of Dividend Paid.

SEVERAL RATES OF COST.										No. of Estates.	RATES OF DIVIDEND		
which the Per-centage of Cost is within 2·5 per cent. of the denoting in which the Costs varied from 7·5 to 12·5 per cent. of assets.											on 329 Estates, closed as above.		
55 p'cent.	60 p'cent.	65 p'cent.	70 p'cent.	75 p'cent.	80 p'cent.	85 p'cent.	90 p'cent.	95 p'cent.	100 p'cent.			No.	Per Cent.
-	-	1	1	1	-	2	-	8	101	116			
2	-	5	4	12	4	8	2	7	51	100	Not exceeding 1 s. in the pound - - -	73	22·19
5	2	2	5	3	4	2	2	4	21	61			
4	4	6	4	3	2	2	-	1	7	57	Exceeding 1 s., and not exceeding 2 s. 6 d. - -	81	24·62
5	1	3	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	38			
-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	1	5	29	„ 2 s. 6 d., and not exceeding 5 s. - -	89	27·05
1	1	1	2	1	-	2	-	1	2	24			
1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	13	„ 5 s., and not exceeding 7 s. 6 d. - -	30	9·12
1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	3	26			
-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	15	„ 7 s. 6 d., and not exceeding 10 s. - -	29	8·81
1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	16			
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	„ 10 s., and not exceeding 15 s. - -	18	5·47
-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	„ 15 s., and not exceeding 20 s. - -	4	1·22
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15			
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	At 20 s. - - - - -	5	1·52
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4			
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4		329	100·00
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2			
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1			
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	Exceeding 10 s. in the pound - - -	27	8·21
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1			
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	Not exceeding 10 s. in the pound - - -	302	91·79
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1			
22	13	19	20	23	10	19	7	22	193	552		329	100·00

by the Bankrupts on a composition being accepted, or 20 s. in the £. being paid to their creditors.

TABLE 8.

LIQUIDATIONS by ARRANGEMENT.

	Petitions Filed.	Resolutions Registered.	Resolutions for Discharge.	Gross Amount of Debts.	Gross Value of Estate.	Gross Amount of Stamp Duty.
				£.	£.	£.
London Bankruptcy Court	1,638	575	203	2,973,714	891,484	4,848
County Courts	6,513	3,865	1,345	8,158,201	2,570,409	19,600
TOTAL	8,151	4,440	1,548	11,131,915	3,461,893	24,448

TABLE 9.

COMPOSITIONS with CREDITORS.

	Resolutions Registered.	Gross Amount of Debts.	Gross Amount of Composition.	Gross Amount of Stamp Duty.
		£.	£.	£.
London Bankruptcy Court	678	2,559,584	591,488	3,882
County Courts	1,871	2,656,532	893,022	6,813
TOTAL	2,549	5,216,116	1,484,510	10,695

NUMBER of COMPOSITIONS at the following RATES:—

	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.	Per Cent.
Not exceeding 1 s. in the pound	204	297	501	19·65
Exceeding 1 s., and not exceeding 2 s. 6 d.	174	384	558	21·89
„ 2 s. 6 d., and not exceeding 5 s.	177	567	744	29·18
„ 5 s., and not exceeding 7 s. 6 d.	54	282	336	13·19
„ 7 s. 6 d., and not exceeding 10 s.	35	212	247	9·69
„ 10 s., and not exceeding 15 s.	16	78	94	3·69
„ 15 s., and under 20 s.	7	14	21	·82
At 20 s.	10	37	47	1·85
No fixed rate	1	-	1	·04
TOTAL	678	1,871	2,549	100·00
Exceeding 10 s. in the pound	34	129	163	6·42
Not exceeding 10 s. in the pound	644	1,742	2,386	93·58

TABLE 10.

SUMMARY of LIABILITIES and ASSETS in BANKRUPTCIES, LIQUIDATIONS by ARRANGEMENT, and COMPOSITIONS with CREDITORS.

	LIABILITIES.			ASSETS.		
	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.	London Bankruptcy Court.	County Courts.	TOTAL.
	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.
Bankruptcies - - - - -	1,891,041	1,897,598	3,788,639	187,528	297,917	485,445
Liquidations by Arrangement -	2,973,714	8,158,201	11,131,915	891,484	2,570,409	3,461,893
Composition with Creditors -	2,559,584	2,656,532	5,216,116	591,488	893,022	1,484,510
TOTAL - - - £.	7,424,339	12,712,331	20,136,670	1,670,500	3,761,348	5,431,848

TABLE 11.

RETURN made by the REGISTRAR of APPEALS in BANKRUPTCY.

NUMBER of Appeals presented to the Court of Appeal in Chancery from 1st January to 31st December 1874									
(both days inclusive) - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
Pending 31st December 1873 - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
									120
Judgments Affirmed - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55
" Reversed - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34
" Varied - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Appeals Withdrawn or Arranged - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
" Pending 31st December 1874 - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
									120
NUMBER of Appeals presented to the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy from 1st January to 31st December 1874									
(both days inclusive) - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111
Pending 31st December 1873 - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
									126
Judgments Affirmed - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44
" Reversed - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
" Varied - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Appeals Referred Back - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
" Arranged - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
" Withdrawn - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18
" Pending 31st December 1874 - - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
									126

TABLE 12.

SUMMARY.

RETURNS of BILLS TAXED by the TAXING MASTER and REGISTRARS during the Year.

	BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869.				OTHER ACTS.				TOTAL.
	No. of Bills.	Gross Amount of Bills.	Struck off.	Net.	No. of Bills.	Gross Amount of Bills.	Struck off.	Net.	
Solicitors' Bills:		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Bankruptcy (London Bankruptcy Court)	579	35,512 5 2	6,706 6 8	28,805 18 6	281	11,354 9 6	2,153 16 6	9,200 13 -	38,006 11 6
Ditto - (County Courts)	1,266	62,293 19 8	10,175 17 4	52,118 2 4	67	3,192 - 2	570 - 10	2,621 19 4	54,740 1 8
Insolvency (L. B. C.)	-	-	-	-	22	1,100 14 8	93 4 -	1,007 10 8	1,007 10 8
Liquidation (L. B. C.)	738	36,234 14 10	7,164 - 4	29,070 14 6	-	-	-	-	29,070 14 6
Ditto - (C. C.)	4,456	164,725 9 5	29,993 2 9	134,732 6 8	-	-	-	-	134,732 6 8
									257,557 5 -
High Bailiffs' Bills:									
Bankruptcy (L. B. C.)	566	1,080 16 9	-	1,080 16 9	180	542 16 3	-	542 16 3	1,623 13 -
Ditto - (C. C.)	2,686	7,847 14 5	12 14 1	7,835 - 4	38	83 3 8	- 18 8	82 5 -	7,917 5 4
Liquidation (L. B. C.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ditto - (C. C.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
									9,540 18 4
Assignees' Bills:									
Bankruptcy (L. B. C.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ditto - (C. C.)	-	-	-	-	5	35 13 11	-	35 13 11	35 13 11
									35 13 11
Auctioneers', Receivers', and Managers' Bills:									
Bankruptcy (L. B. C.)	124	4,805 14 5	448 19 10	4,356 14 7	25	980 10 7	144 7 5	836 3 2	5,192 17 9
Ditto - (C. C.)	509	7,807 4 4	621 10 8	7,185 13 8	2	5 16 9	- 12 7	5 4 2	7,190 17 10
Liquidation (L. B. C.)	82	3,913 18 -	820 3 5	3,093 14 7	-	-	-	-	3,093 14 7
Ditto - (C. C.)	1,792	30,521 14 10	3,535 4 2	26,986 10 8	-	-	-	-	26,986 10 8
									42,464 - 10
Trustees' Bills:									
Bankruptcy (L. B. C.)	1	71 14 1	-	71 14 1	-	-	-	-	71 14 1
Ditto - (C. C.)	221	9,811 13 5	656 3 -	9,155 10 5	-	-	-	-	9,155 10 5
Liquidation (L. B. C.)	12	1,254 10 2	-	1,254 10 2	-	-	-	-	1,254 10 2
Ditto - (C. C.)	559	23,699 15 7	1,143 13 7	22,556 2 -	-	-	-	-	22,556 2 -
									33,037 16 8
Accountants' Bills:									
Bankruptcy (L. B. C.)	-	-	-	-	1	31 11 1	-	31 11 1	31 11 1
Ditto - (C. C.)	66	1,234 3 10	229 4 9	1,004 19 1	-	-	-	-	1,004 19 1
Liquidation (L. B. C.)	1	74 13 11	-	74 13 11	-	-	-	-	74 13 11
Ditto - (C. C.)	263	3,234 15 3	331 - 2	2,903 15 1	-	-	-	-	2,903 15 1
									4,014 19 2
Other Bills:									
Bankruptcy (L. B. C.)	-	-	-	-	13	699 19 8	7 17 8	692 2 -	692 2 -
Ditto - (C. C.)	84	1,138 6 10	192 8 9	945 18 1	2	1 - 6	-	1 - 6	946 18 7
Liquidation (L. B. C.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ditto - (C. C.)	197	2,591 9 7	447 14 2	2,143 15 5	-	-	-	-	2,143 15 5
									3,762 16 -
Bankruptcy Act, 1869	14,202	397,854 14 6	62,478 3 8	335,376 10 10	636	18,027 16 9	2,970 17 8	15,056 19 1	
Other Acts	636	18,027 16 9	2,970 17 8	15,056 19 1					
TOTAL	14,838	415,882 11 3	65,449 1 4	350,433 9 11					350,433 9 11

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869.

GENERAL REPORT

BY THE

COMPTROLLER IN BANKRUPTCY,

For the Year ending 31st December 1874.

(Made in pursuance of Section 115 of the Bankruptcy
Act, 1869.)

(Presented pursuant to Act of Parliament.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,

21 June 1875.

272.

Under 2 oz.

R E P O R T S

TO

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

ON

THE STATE OF THE LAW RELATING TO
BRUTAL ASSAULTS, &c.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.



LONDON:

PRINTED BY GEORGE EDWARD EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1875.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
CIRCULAR No. 1. - - - - -	3
ANSWERS:	
FROM COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH - - - - -	5
FROM COURT OF COMMON PLEAS - - - - -	10
FROM COURT OF EXCHEQUER - - - - -	17
FROM SCOTCH JUDGES - - - - -	21
FROM CHAIRMEN OF QUARTER SESSIONS - - - - -	22
FROM RECORDERS OF BOROUGHs HAVING QUARTER SESSIONS - - - - -	64
FROM STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES - - - - -	102
FROM MAGISTRATES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS - - - - -	113
FROM SHERIFFS AND SHERIFFS-SUBSTITUTE (SCOTLAND) - - - - -	115
 CIRCULAR No. 2 - - - - -	 148
ANSWERS:	
FROM COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS - - - - -	149
FROM COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE CITY OF LONDON - - - - -	149
FROM CHIEF CONSTABLES OF COUNTIES - - - - -	150
ABSTRACTS OF REPORTS OF CHIEF CONSTABLES - - - - -	169

Circular (No. 1) addressed to—

HER MAJESTY'S JUDGES.

CHAIRMAN OF QUARTER SESSIONS.

RECORDERS OF BOROUGHs HAVING QUARTER SESSIONS.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES.

MAGISTRATES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS.

SHERIFFS AND SHERIFFS SUBSTITUTE OF COUNTIES (SCOTLAND).

Sir,

Whitehall, October 15, 1874.

Mr. Secretary Cross having at present under his consideration the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of the crimes of violence, now unhappily so common among certain classes of the population, I am directed to acquaint you that he is desirous of ascertaining what are the views of those engaged in the administration of justice with reference to the points raised in the following questions:—

1. Is the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, sufficiently stringent, and, if not, in what way should it be amended?
2. Are there any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at Assizes and Quarter Sessions?
3. Is it desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by Courts of Summary Jurisdiction should be extended?
4. Should flogging be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., especially in cases of assaults on women and children?
5. Has flogging been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.?

Mr. Cross will be greatly obliged if you will favour him at your convenience with your observations and opinion on these points.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON.

REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN REPLY TO PRECEDING CIRCULAR.

From Court of Queen's Bench.

No. 1.

Lord Chief Justice Cockburn to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

November 30, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, asking my opinion, for your information, on the following points:—

1. Is the Penal Law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults, on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, sufficiently stringent; and, if not, in what way should it be amended?

2. Are there any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished which should be declared triable only at Assizes and Quarter Sessions?

3. Is it desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by Courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended?

4. Should flogging be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. especially in cases of assaults on women and children?

5. Has flogging been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.?

In reply, I beg to state that, in my opinion, the Penal Law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent. The manner in which I think it should be amended is to be found in my answers to the 3rd and 4th of the foregoing questions.

I think, in the first place, that the maximum fine and the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by Courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended. And I say this not only because I believe that the punishment which such Courts are now empowered to inflict is not in itself sufficiently severe, but also because I think that, by increasing the penalty which such courts are empowered to impose, magistrates will be encouraged to treat assaults of this nature with greater severity than (judging from the reports of such cases as published in the newspapers) they have hitherto been in the habit of dealing with them.

I am of opinion that flogging has been found efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by the 26 & 27 Vict. cap. 44.

I think that flogging may well be authorised for violence in cases of brutal assault, where, from the nature of the assault it appears that bodily injury to the person was intended, and such injury has actually resulted.

I do not think that such cases should be confined to assaults on women and children. Savage assaults on the police in the execution of their duty, attended with serious personal injury, appear of not unfrequent occurrence, and it seems to me that in aggravated cases of this character this punishment would be appropriate, and calculated to prevent this species of outrage. Nor would I confine the power to inflict this punishment to cases of assault on the police. Brutal assaults on individuals might, in cases of a very aggravated nature, be dealt with in like manner. It frequently happens that death results from violence under circumstances of great atrocity, but where, owing to the facts not warranting a conviction for murder, the party causing the death can only be convicted of manslaughter. I think that the infliction of corporal punishment in such cases would operate beneficially in deterring persons of ferocious disposition and habits from committing such crimes.

Being, however, of opinion that corporal punishment should only be inflicted in cases of violence and outrage of a very aggravated character, and further, that it should only be applied after the fullest inquiry, I think that all such cases—that is to say, where bodily injury was intended and has resulted—should be sent for trial to the Assizes or Quarter Sessions. I also think that the maximum of punishment should be twenty-four lashes.

In recommending the infliction of corporal punishment in such cases, I assume that the punishment in its infliction will be kept within due bounds of moderation and humanity, and, while it carries with it such an amount of bodily pain as shall operate to deter offenders from acts of brutal violence, shall not be unnecessarily severe, or calculated to cause prolonged suffering to the party undergoing it. I presume that the degree of severity with which the punishment is to be inflicted will not be left to the discretion of those who are to inflict it, but will always be under the regulation and direction of the Executive Government.

I wish it also to be understood that, in assenting to the applications of corporal punishment to cases of assault, I limit myself entirely to cases in which personal injury is the immediate purpose of the assault. I do not think it would be expedient to extend it to cases of indecent assault, for this simple reason—the experience of Courts of Justices teaches us that such charges are frequently brought for the purpose of extorting money. I think that the possibility of the ignominious punishment of flogging following upon such a charge would operate unduly on the minds of timid persons against whom such charges might be brought, and would be a great encouragement to evil-minded persons to bring forward fictitious complaints of this sort. I think that the existing law is sufficiently stringent to deal with such cases; at all events, that corporal punishment, if applied to such cases at all, should be confined to those in which personal violence of an outrageous character and attended with bodily injury has accompanied the act.

I beg also to be understood in desiring to limit the application of corporal punishment to cases in which bodily injury has been the purpose of the offender, I am addressing myself only to cases of assault, whether the application of that punishment in a moderate degree might not be the most efficacious punishment in the case of habitual criminals, such as pickpockets and the like, especially the case of juvenile offenders, is a matter which may be open to consideration, but it is one in which the questions submitted to me, as I understand them, do not call for any expression of opinion, and I therefore wish to be understood as not offering any.

I have, &c.
(Signed) A. E. COCKBURN.

No. 2.

Mr. Justice Blackburn to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

Sir,

November 17, 1874.

I answer the five questions put to me by you on behalf of Mr. Secretary Cross in their order.

1. I do not see any alteration which could with advantage be made in the law on this subject, unless it be by giving power to the Court to sentence a person convicted of an assault of an aggravated kind, or perhaps on a second conviction for an assault of any kind, to flogging. As to this I refer to my answer to the fourth question.

2. I am not aware of any; but as I am not in a position to make me personally cognizant of the manner in which the law is practically worked in country districts, I do not think my opinion on this subject should be much regarded.

3. As a general rule, whenever the offence is of so grave a character as to require a heavy punishment, it ought not to be tried by a summary jurisdiction. I should say, therefore, that the maximum sentence of imprisonment imposable by a Court of Summary Jurisdiction should not be extended to a longer term than six months.

4. This is a difficult question. A very important object ought to be to make the sentence such as will deter others from such crimes.

I have long thought that though penal servitude is thought a very severe punishment, the dread of it does not operate so as to deter persons from what may be called crimes of malicious mischief, such, for instance, as setting fire to property by ill-conditioned tramps, with no particular malice against the owner; or putting obstructions on railways, without any particular ill-will to those whose lives and property are thus endangered. And I should expect that the knowledge that the punishment might commence with flogging would, in such cases, be deterring.

I incline to think that it would also operate as deterring in cases of brutal violence, though I feel less sure of this. On the other hand, if the sentence of the law was to make the criminal the subject of sympathy to his class, and lead him to be regarded by them as a martyr, this would prevent it from being deterring.

On the whole, I think it would be advisable to try the experiment, both in the class of cases to which I have alluded of malicious mischief, and in aggravated or repeated

assaults, though I would not, at least at first, intrust this power to any but the judges at assizes.

5. I have no better means of forming an opinion on this point than any ordinary person; these offences have certainly been less frequent since the power of making flogging part of the sentence was given, and I draw the inference that the diminution is, at least, partly due to that cause.

I have, &c.
(Signed) COLIN BLACKBURN.

No. 3.

Mr. Justice Mellor to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

Sir, 16, Sussex Square, Hyde Park, W., October 28, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Circular of the 15th instant.

I think that the law is not sufficiently stringent in cases of brutal assaults and violence. I think that a power to order flogging, in addition to any other sentence at present authorized, might be well conferred upon Judges of Assize and Commissioners, as also upon Courts of Quarter Sessions. I think in some cases two floggings might be authorised at such intervals as the Court might direct. I think that such power should be extended to rapes and attempts to commit rapes, and also to bad cases of indecent assaults upon women and female children.

I am not inclined to think that such power should be conferred upon parties in Petty Sessions; they should be authorised to remand a case to the Assizes or Quarter Sessions whenever it appeared in evidence to be of a really serious character, although the inquiry was instituted as a summary trial.

I also think that, in cases of mischief by boys under 14, such as arson, throwing stones, &c., upon a railway, &c., and whether classed as a felony or misdemeanor, it would be well to authorise the same kind of punishment.

I am, &c.
(Signed) JNO. MELLOR.

No. 4.

Mr. Justice Lush to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

Sir, 60, Avenue Road, November 16, 1874.

I have to apologise for the delay in answering your Circular of the 15th October.

1. The law against assaults of brutal violence is not, in my opinion, sufficiently stringent. I think it should be amended by authorising, as an additional punishment, flogging or whipping as prescribed by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., subject to the observation I will presently make as to the maximum number of strokes.

2. Experience has shown that it will not do to leave to the discretion of the magistrate either to punish summarily or to commit for trial charges of this description. The line must be drawn by the Legislature, and I do not know how it is to be done otherwise than by enacting that all cases within the 47th section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., shall be withdrawn from the summary jurisdiction. No doubt this will include cases which will be sufficiently punished by six months' imprisonment, but it seems to me impossible to classify them by definition, so as to secure that acts of brutal violence be duly punished; and that there is no remedy for the present evil but to send all such cases, that is, all where "actual bodily harm" has been occasioned, to trial. The Act 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. may stand as it is, except that flogging or whipping will be added to the punishment prescribed by the first clause of section 47.

3. I think it is not desirable that the maximum fine or term of imprisonment to be imposed by Courts of Summary Jurisdiction be extended.

4. Besides cases of assault occasioning "actual bodily harm" I think flogging or whipping, according to the age of the offender, should be authorised for rapes upon children under 10 years of age, and in all cases of rape where two or more persons are jointly concerned in the perpetration.

5. I believe it has. When I first went to Manchester, in the spring of 1866, there was a general feeling of alarm at the prevalence of what is called "garotting." It had increased, notwithstanding that heavy sentences of penal servitude had been awarded

at the previous assizes. I flogged every one—as many, I think, as 20 or 21. I went again in the summer of the same year, and had to administer the same punishment to about half the number. I have been there five times since, and have, I believe, only had one such case, and that was three or four years ago. The same result has followed at Leeds and Chester, and the crime has all but disappeared. From what I have seen and heard from the prisoners, some of whom have implored me to give any term of penal servitude rather than the “cat,” and from what I have been told by Governors of gaols, I have no doubt that flogging is more dreaded than any amount of imprisonment or penal servitude, and that the suppression of “garotting” is attributable solely to this kind of punishment.

The application of it, however, requires great discretion; and as, if these suggestions be adopted, the power to award it will be extended to Courts of Quarter Session, and to Recorders, to persons who have not the opportunity, as we have, of consulting with each other, and forming a conventional tariff, I think that care should be taken to guard against any excess. This kind of punishment cannot, like others, be corrected after infliction, and it will be tolerated only to the extent to which it is found to be necessary. Any amount beyond this measure would be cruelty to the prisoner, and would be likely to evoke sympathy on the wrong side.

The Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. authorises as many as 50 strokes at a time. No Judge has ever, I believe, awarded more than 25, but a Commissioner at the Old Bailey has awarded, on one occasion, the full number of 50, and on more than one occasion 30. My range has been from 18 to 24, and this has proved sufficient. I submit that it would be expedient to reduce the maximum in all cases from 50 to 25 strokes.

While on this subject, I beg to be allowed to suggest the expediency of extending flogging to some few cases not within the scope of the Circular, namely:—

1. To attempts to throw a train off the rails, by placing matters upon the rail, removing rails, displacing points, &c. (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 32., 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97. s. 35.). For this diabolical crime, which is not uncommon, I think flogging should be allowed. Whipping is authorised, when the culprit is under 16, a case which has not occurred within my experience, but for adults, and all who have come before me for this offence have been such, there is only the ordinary punishment of penal servitude or imprisonment.

2. Section 33 deals with the case of throwing stones or other missiles on to a passing train. This is not an uncommon case, and it is generally committed, as far as my experience goes, by boys, who get upon a bridge which runs over the line, and drop stones down upon the carriages for amusement. A whipping would be far more effectual and less demoralising than imprisonment, and yet for this offence whipping is not allowed.

3. At this season, particularly, arson of stacks and farm buildings is not unfrequently resorted to by tramps and vagrants from some motive or other. I think that flogging would have the effect of stopping, in a great measure, this mischievous propensity.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ROBT. LUSH.

No. 5.

Mr. Justice Quain to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

22A, Cavendish Square, November 16, 1874.

In reply to your Circular of the 15th of October, I beg to state, as the result of my experience, that flogging has been most efficacious in putting down the offences mentioned in the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., and that it is highly desirable to extend it to other cases of violence, such as Lancashire and Yorkshire kicking and clogging, and especially to cases of assault on women and children.

Flogging is the only punishment (except the punishment of death) that seems to retain any real deterrent power about it.

There is one difficulty about it, that some sentimental Judges will not inflict it.

I strongly recommend that Justices in petty sessions be empowered to order a moderate birching on the proper place (not to be called flogging) on boy offenders of and under 14 years of age. Boys of that age should be treated not criminally, but paternally; they should not be sent to be tried as felons or misdemeanants at sessions or assizes.

A circuit or two ago three boys under 14 were sent to be tried before me for arson. They were having a rat-hunt in a farm-yard, and they determined to smoke out the rats, and so burnt down a bean-stack. I think it very absurd, under such circumstances, to try three children for felony.

After a first offence the Justices should have power to send them to an Industrial School.

I have not sufficient experience of Courts of summary jurisdiction to offer any observations on Questions 2 and 3.

Yours, &c.
(Signed) J. R. QUAIN

No. 6.

Mr. Justice Archibald to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

7, Porchester Gate, November 17, 1874.

I regret that the daily pressure of judicial duties has prevented me from replying earlier to your Circular of the 15th ultimo, with reference to the more effectual repression of certain crimes of violence.

As regards the 1st question in the Circular I think that, except in the absence of power to inflict flogging to which I will refer presently, the penal law against assaults of the kind referred to is, so far as punishment is concerned, sufficiently stringent; but the vague and indefinite phraseology used in the description of such crimes appears, practically, apt to lead to serious failures in its administration.

Upon indictment a common assault is punishable by a year's imprisonment, with or without hard labour; and assaults causing "actual bodily harm" and "grievous bodily harm" are both punishable with penal servitude, the former with five years' penal servitude and the latter for life.

But Justices of the Peace have (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 42.) jurisdiction to deal summarily with "assaults," and under s. 48 with assaults on women and children described as "aggravated assaults." In the former case the limit of punishment that may be imposed by them is, in addition to fines, two months; and in the latter six months' imprisonment, with or without hard labour; though, in either case, if the assault have been accompanied by any attempt to commit a felony, or should from any other circumstances be a fit subject for indictment, the Justices are required to commit the prisoner for trial.

It is obvious that these provisions leave to justices a very wide discretion to put their own construction upon the terms "assault" and "aggravated assault;" the term "assault" being in truth a generic term under which are included, not only common assaults, but assaults causing actual bodily harm and assaults causing grievous bodily harm. And practically, therefore, as the law stands, justices with limited powers of punishment not infrequently deal summarily with cases which ought to be sent by them for trial at the sessions or assizes, and public indignation has been aroused by the strange inadequacy at times of the punishments awarded for assault of a brutal character.

In order to avoid the possibility of such failure of justice in future, I would suggest that provisions should be made prohibiting justices from dealing summarily with cases which demand a more severe punishment than ought to be inflicted without the intervention of a jury. In effecting this object it would not, in my judgment, be expedient to attempt a precise definition of either "actual bodily harm" or "grievous bodily harm." Any such attempt might unduly and inconveniently limit the meaning of such phrases. But I think it advisable to enact that justices should not adjudicate summarily upon any assault which has caused, or is likely to cause—1st. Permanent injury to any joint, limb, organ, or member; 2nd. Any permanent disfigurement of the head or face; 3rd. Any such injury as has caused, or is likely to cause, the sufferer to be in severe bodily pain for the space of, say, 21 days; or, 4th. Which prevents, or is likely to prevent, him for the same period from following his ordinary pursuits or calling.

I also think that power should be given to Judges of Assize and to the Justices at Sessions, in their discretion, to inflict the punishment of flogging for assaults causing "grievous bodily harm," when committed under circumstances of great brutality, a qualification, however, which will require great care in the framing of such a provision.

As to second question I have already, in effect, partly answered it in my reply to the first, in which I have stated the kind of assaults which, in my judgment, ought not to be dealt with summarily. There may be assaults causing injuries less grave, but still of a

serious and aggravated character which justices however ought to send for trial. As to any assault upon which they may properly adjudicate summarily, I think it would be inexpedient to extend the maximum term of imprisonment beyond six months, or the maximum fine beyond 20*l*.

In reply to the third and fourth questions, as far as I can judge, flogging has proved to be a deterring punishment of great efficiency in the cases in which it may be at present imposed. Besides the other cases already suggested it appears to me advisable to extend to the Judges of Assize power to inflict it in cases of rape or attempt at rape by two or more persons jointly.

I have, &c.
(Signed) T. D. ARCHIBALD.

From Court of Common Pleas.

No. 7.

The Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross.

Sir,

1, Sussex Square, London, W., December 5, 1874.

I beg leave to express my regret if I have at all inconvenienced you by my delay in answering Sir Henry Selwin Ibbetson's Circular of the 15th October. I have been very much engaged since I received it, and I can now only answer it hastily and imperfectly. I may observe that for the last eight or nine years of my practice at the Bar, I hardly ever entered a Criminal Court, and that my experience as a judge is as yet too slight to give me the materials for forming with any confidence an independent opinion; but as you desire it I proceed to answer your questions to the best of my ability.

1. I think the law itself is quite sufficiently stringent for the punishment of brutal assaults. Five years' penal servitude or (in most prisons) two years' imprisonment with hard labour, which may now be given under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47. is an amount of punishment which, if it were resolutely inflicted in all bad assaults, would, I believe, be found quite sufficiently deterrent. Of course where the assault is felonious, and the punishment may be much heavier, this observation applies with even greater force. The feeling which has arisen, I am far from saying without reasonable grounds, in the public mind is founded rather I think upon Magistrates having dealt with cases under the 42nd and 43rd sections of the same Act, which were quite unfit to be so dealt with, than upon any want of sufficient severity in the law itself if properly enforced, and if administered by the proper persons. Magistrates ought not I think to be allowed summarily to enforce any sentences heavier than those authorised by the last-mentioned sections; for my own part I doubt if they should be allowed to pass summarily sentences even so severe. But I believe that they often in fact try cases under the 42nd and 43rd sections which it is plainly intended by the 46th section (though no doubt that section gives discretion) that they should not try. It is in the limiting or entirely taking away this discretion that I believe one remedy at least for the present state of feeling is to be found. This is undoubtedly a delicate and difficult matter to handle satisfactorily. But upon the whole I think that no case of assault occasioning actual bodily harm should be even within the jurisdiction of Magistrates at all except at Quarter Sessions.

2. It follows from what I have said, that if I am to answer this question simply in the negative or the affirmative, I should answer it in the negative. But I think that many assaults are now in fact summarily (and as a consequence very inadequately) punished which ought in fact to be tried only at Assizes or Quarter Sessions. The three sections I have already referred to have not worked well in practice, though their intention is unexceptionable; and the phraseology of them, therefore, needs to be reconsidered.

3. Certainly not. The remedy for a state of things which has given rise to complaints not unfounded, is to be found in quite a different kind of change.

4. I answer this question with much doubt and hesitation, but upon the whole in the negative, subject to an exception which I will explain. In cases where the punishment inflicted on the criminal is a short term of imprisonment, I do not think it would tend to diminish crime, or to increase the personal safety of the victim of the brutality, to supple-

ment imprisonment, as it were, by corporal pain. I should expect the effect, in both regards, to be the reverse. I will not discuss the whole theory of punishments, but I clearly think there are extreme cases, in which the cruelty and wickedness of the criminal will justify, and if they will justify they will call for, the infliction upon him of bodily suffering. I should say, therefore, that where the crime of violence is such as either to amount to a felony, or to come within the 47th section of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. flogging should be capable of being inflicted at the discretion of the Judge. But I think, for the reasons suggested at the beginning of this answer, that it should not be capable of being inflicted except in connexion with penal servitude for at least five years, or with imprisonment for at least eighteen months. I tried a man at Monmouth in the spring of this year, who had subjected his wife to a course of brutal cruelty for years, ending in what I have no manner of doubt was her murder. The Jury found him guilty of manslaughter, and I sentenced him to penal servitude for life. But in that case I should have been glad, and I think every one who heard the case would have been glad, if the law had allowed me to inflict upon him severe bodily suffering in addition to his servitude. No danger would follow from such a power as this, and as far as I can form an opinion the existence of such a power would be deterrent, and therefore useful.

5. I have no sufficient experience to enable me to answer this question with any satisfaction to myself one way or the other.

I beg that you will take my opening observations along with you in considering all these answers.

I am, &c.
(Signed) COLERIDGE.

No. 8.

Mr. Justice Keating to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

Sir,

11, Prince's Gardens, November 16, 1874.

In answer to the questions contained in your Circular dated the 15th October, I beg to state:—

1. I think the Penal Law against the assaults mentioned in this question is sufficiently stringent. What is called "brutal violence," I presume means that sort of violence which occasions "actual bodily harm," for which a sentence of imprisonment with hard labour up to two years, or a sentence of five years' penal servitude may be passed, if the violence cause a "wounding," which will be satisfied in points of law by breaking the continuity of the skin, "with intent to do grievous bodily harm," a sentence up to penal servitude for life may be passed. The law, if properly applied, seems to me sufficiently stringent.

2. All aggravated assaults should be sent before a jury, and magistrates ought in such cases to commit and not convict. It is, however, difficult to define the degree of aggravation which should absolutely oust jurisdiction, it must be left to their discretion.

3. This is a question that Justices of the Peace would be able more satisfactorily to answer.

4 and 5. These questions involve the propriety of reintroducing into our Penal Code, or extending the retrograde legislation of former times, the flogging of adults as a punishment, a system in my opinion likely to produce the most pernicious results. The 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. was passed during a panic, occasioned by some audacious robberies with violence in the metropolis, and it was even proposed to make the sentence obligatory upon the Judges; not being so, I myself have never passed it, nor do I believe I am singular in that respect. I know the late Mr. Justice Willes, who thought much upon such subjects, was wholly opposed to it. The punishment is simply retaliating, a principle I had supposed long since exploded. It is also most unequal in its application; the number of lashes that would bring down the pulse of one man to a faint, will be taken by another with comparative indifference, and yet the Judge who passes the sentence has not the means of discriminating. It is true all punishments are more or less unequal, but their inequality can be in some degree corrected, but not so with the punishment of flogging. It is neither reformatory nor deterrent, which are the great objects of all punishments. It does not reform, for if the culprits be naturally brutal, it makes him still more so, and if one was tempted to the commission of crime the flogging makes him desperate, stifles every regret or desire of amendment, and sends him forth a branded and hardened criminal. When flogging prevailed in the army and navy, I believe that generally the same men were constantly punished for similar offences, and I should be

surprised if a case could be found where a flogged man became less vicious. How far the effect of the late statute has been reformatory or deterrent is not easily traced; as far as my own experience goes I have not observed such effects. Some years since a brother Judge at the Leeds assizes ordered flogging in every case within the statute. I went to Leeds on the following circuit, and he wrote to me to inquire how far the result of his system had been salutary. I was obliged to inform him that the number of such cases happened to be considerably larger, so much so that I was forced to pass very severe sentences. I have been also told by another of my brethren that at the same town of Leeds he has had prisoners before him again charged having already been flogged; but the extent of this could be ascertained by Returns, although ten or eleven years is not perhaps sufficient to test the full effects of such a statute. I have heard Judges say that the sentence of flogging produces great terror and alarm, and I can well understand it; no man likes to be told he is to be flogged; but the question is not what is his state when sentenced, but what is the effect *after* he has been so punished. But does it deter others? I think not; a private flogging in a prison can scarcely have that effect; to be logical, the flogging should be as formerly at the cart's tail; yet no one can doubt the effect of such an exhibition would be to brutalise the masses. It is supposed that a man knowing the punishment to be annexed to a particular crime will avoid it; but I believe nine-tenths of the crimes of violence committed throughout England originate in public houses, and are committed under circumstances which exclude all reflection. The desire that he who inflicts pain should himself experience it, is a very natural feeling, but should not in my opinion enter into a system of deliberate judicial punishments. The present outcry arises from some lenient sentences having been passed in cases of brutal assaults; but these cases will not be met by a resort to a punishment so objectionable as flogging, and one long abandoned from experience of its defects. I do not make these observations in any spirit of silly sentimentalism. If flogging really answered the objects for which punishment is inflicted, it ought to be resorted to; but I have a deep conviction that it is a mistake. During more than forty years' experience of Criminal Courts I have observed crimes diminish under a steady and comparatively lenient administration of the law; but I think the resort to flogging as a punishment will have a tendency to create a criminal class even more desperate than any that now exists. Of course, these remarks apply only to the flogging of adults; as to boys, it is often the most appropriate, or, indeed, the only punishment that can be inflicted; and here I would direct your attention to the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97., the 85th section allows whipping under 16 years in offences seldom committed by boys, whilst there is no such power under section 36 within which boys often come.

Apologising for not sooner replying to your letter,

I am, &c.
(Signed) H. S. KEATING.

No. 9.

Mr. Justice Brett to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

In answer to the questions dated the 16th October 1874, upon which you have asked my opinion, I think it is necessary to point out in the first place that the phrase, "assaults of brutal violence" may comprise all assaults from "wounding with intent to murder" to an assault "causing actual bodily harm."

Such assaults are classified in different sections of the Statute 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., as in sections 11, 15, 18, 20, 21, and 47, and various punishments are made applicable to them, from a sentence of penal servitude for life to imprisonment with hard labour, not exceeding two years. The distinctions of crime seem to be carefully enumerated, and the punishments sufficiently stringent, unless flogging is to be added in some or all of the different classes of offence. The answer to the first question, therefore, depends upon whether flogging should be added to the sentence in some or all of the cases.

The peculiar characteristic of this form of punishment is that it has come to be considered more degrading than any other, in the sense that it renders him who has suffered it more contemptible or despicable than any one who has suffered any other punishment. But punishment should accord with offence. It seems to follow that, if inflicted at all, this punishment should be inflicted for crimes which are in the same sense more contemptible or despicable than others, either from their nature or the manner in

which they were committed. Now the mere seriousness of a crime does not make it contemptible or despicable. Murder, the greatest of crimes, is not, in the sense in which I have used the terms, contemptible or despicable. Nor are necessarily a wounding, with intent to maim, or disfigure, or do grievous bodily harm. Nor is necessarily an assault doing actual bodily harm. A brutal assault is not necessarily a contemptible or despicable assault in the sense in which I use the terms. An assault which is contemptible or despicable is one which, in usual phrase, is called "a cowardly assault." The contemptibility depends upon whether the assault is committed upon one who is relatively and obviously defenceless: as where it is by a man on a woman, or child, or on a cripple, or on a manifestly weaker man, or on a disabled man, whether disabled by the offender or otherwise, or where the assault is by two or more men on one; or by a vastly superior number on a few; or where it is by such a breach of trust as gives the assaulter a surreptitious and designed advantage by surprise. All these are commonly called cowardly assaults, meaning thereby that the assaulter would have feared to attack without believing that he had an unfair advantage. Such cowardly assaults are contemptible or despicable. With these, therefore, the punishment of flogging is by its and their nature in accordance. It is not in accordance with assaults merely, because they are aggravated by being serious or brutal.

If, therefore, the punishment is to be enacted at all, it should not in my opinion, be made applicable merely because the crime of which a prisoner is convicted is either by its nature or from the manner or to the extent in which it was committed in the particular case aggravated by brutality or excess, but only where it was committed in the particular case in a mode or manner which makes it contemptible, despicable, cowardly, as well as brutal.

Whether the punishment of flogging should be enacted at all seems to me to be a question which requires very careful consideration.

If it be enacted, it is a return to a punishment which was once common in our legislation and in practice, but was discontinued by reason of the almost universal horror with which it came to be regarded.

According to that old experience, therefore, it failed. More recently it was reintroduced in certain cases of crime by the provisions of the Statute 26 & 27 Vict. cap. 44. And according to my experience it has, as applied to those cases, certainly had a material deterring efficacy. But it has, in my opinion, been applied mainly, though not invariably, in cases of crimes committed by young men. This has been so, because it has been inflicted mainly in cases of street robberies, which have, in fact, been committed by young men. The punishment, as described, has caused these young men not only to feel pain but to manifest that pain by unmanly cries. The descriptions have had a great deterring effect. But in the cases to which public attention is now directed, the criminals will generally be older men. If these can bear the punishment with greater fortitude, as soldiers used to do, they may begin to pride themselves among their fellows upon, and may be more admired for their courage under suffering than despised for their cowardice in attack, and then the deterring effect will cease.

If in some affecting instance the flogging be too painful, or there be a fatal result, passionate philanthropy will again take fright and interfere.

Again, one of the most difficult parts of the award of punishments is the difficulty of getting different Judges or Tribunals to view as similar facts which are in truth similar, and so to award identical or similar punishment upon identical or similar facts. Different sentences passed on similar facts in different cases are a great evil; yet this is an unavoidable evil. At present the nature of the punishments awarded is not such as attracts prominently attention to the difference of the amount of punishment awarded in similar cases. The difference of the number of years of imprisonment or penal servitude is, to the mass of observers, but a figure. But the sentence of flogging will strike the multitude at once. And if in two cases so similar in circumstances as to be almost identical, one man is flogged and the other not, the difference of the sentences will be immediately observed, and the difference will be disastrous. The differences will be more numerous, and therefore, more often remarked, and therefore the mischief will be greater, the more Judges or Tribunals there are empowered to award this punishment. If, therefore, this punishment is to be enacted, it seems to me to follow that the power of inflicting it should be confined to as few Judges as possible.

A governing rule in enacting punishment for crime is that no more severity should be used than is just as punishment, or necessary in order to repress the recurrence of the offence. Punishment is not to be pointed only to the deterring of others than the convicted offender. A criminal is worthy of punishment, and should be punished according to the nature of his offence. But if the crime is frequent, each criminal must be punished more

than he otherwise would be, in order not only to punish him but to deter others. Still, punishment inflicted in either view must not be pushed so far as to be cruel. Where the punishment is, without flogging, very severe, I think that an addition of flogging would make the sentence degenerate into cruelty. No one would add a sentence of flogging to a sentence of death, or, I think, to a sentence of penal servitude for life. Such a sentence could not be justified on the ground that the flogging of the criminal would deter others from committing the like offence.

Upon consideration, I should say that if flogging is to be enacted at all it should be confined to cases where the sentence is otherwise one of imprisonment for not more than two years, or of penal servitude not exceeding five years. That which is in favour of enacting the punishment of flogging in certain cases, is that it is, in my opinion, clearly a deterring punishment, and that certain cowardly assaults, punished as they now are, increase in number and violence. That which is against the suggested enactment is that it is a return to a punishment which was formerly tried and failed; that it is a punishment which to be of any effect must be applied to powerful men, and which may, when applied to them, lose its effect; that it is a punishment which will necessarily call mischievous attention to inevitable diversity of judgment; that it is a punishment which may come to be considered to be cruel and barbarous.

I cannot help thinking that, in the face of the increase in number and violence of cowardly and aggravated assaults, the administration of the law, as it exists, has not been applied with a vigour and consistency which would have been advisable. If in all cases of such assaults magistrates had refrained from summary punishment, as for merely aggravated assault, and had committed the accused for trial before a Judge and jury, for the offences set forth in the Statute 24 and 25 Vict. c. 100., the existing law might have repressed the recurrence of the crime.

Having regard to the efficacy of the existing law, if applied with due care and vigour, and to the balance of advantage and disadvantage of the suggested alteration, I am of opinion that it is not necessary, and therefore not advisable, to add the punishment of flogging to the punishments already applicable to assaults of brutal violence; and I, therefore, answer the first question by saying that, in my opinion, the penal law is in such cases now sufficiently stringent.

But if it be thought better to add the punishment of flogging in certain cases, I think it should be enacted only in cases where the offence should be charged in an indictment, and found by a jury to have been not only brutal, but also cowardly. I would have the meaning of cowardly, as used in the Statute and in the indictment, defined in the Statute. I would make the possibility of the passing of the sentence depend on the verdict of a jury. I would confine the possibility of the passing of the sentence to cases tried at the Assizes or at the Central Criminal Court.

If flogging is to be added to existing sentences in cases of brutal and cowardly assaults, I would add it also in another class of cases, which are equally cowardly, contemptible, despicable, brutal, and increasing; I mean the cases of indecent assaults, or felonious carnal knowledge, of infant female children by grown men, described in sections 50 and 51 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.

In answer to the second question, I should say that there are no cases which may now be summarily punished which should be declared triable only at Assizes or Quarter Sessions. The defect in treatment, if any now existing, is, as I have ventured to suggest, not that the cases which are sometimes punished summarily could not be sent to the Assizes to be tried, but that some Magistrates treat facts as establishing only assaults under sections 42 and 43 of the Statute, when they do establish more serious crimes under sections 18 and 20. They punish summarily when they might commit for trial at the Assizes.

I answer the third question in the negative.

I answer the fourth question in the negative.

I answer the fifth question in the affirmative.

I add a form of the Statute I would enact, if any is to be enacted, such form, of course, to be carefully reconsidered:—

“Whenever any person is charged with a felonious assault, or an assault causing actual bodily harm, it shall be lawful to allege that such assault was a brutal and cowardly assault; and if, upon the trial of such charge, a jury should find, not only that there was such a felonious assault, or assault causing actual bodily harm, but also that such assault was brutal and cowardly, it shall be lawful for the Judge to add to the sentence applicable by law to such felonious assault, or assault causing actual bodily harm, the sentence of

flogging, contained in the Statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. Provided that no woman shall be charged or sentenced as aforesaid, and that such charge shall only be made at Assizes, or at the sittings of the Central Criminal Court.

"It shall be lawful for a Judge, in case of a conviction under sections 50 and 51 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. to add to the sentence now by law applicable to the offence, a sentence of flogging according to the Statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44."

In this latter case it is not necessary that the cowardice and brutality should be charged and found, because they are inherent in the crime itself.

"It shall be lawful for a jury to find that an assault is cowardly when it is by a man on a woman, or a child, or on a cripple, or on a manifestly weaker man, or on a disabled man, whether disabled by the offender or otherwise, or where the assault is by two or more men on one, or by a greatly superior number of men on a few, or where it is by such a breach of trust as gives to the offender a surreptitious and designed advantage, by surprise, or under circumstances like to these."

I need hardly say that this is a mere sketch, which should be put into form if adopted.

I have suggested a mode of carrying out the proposed legislation, if it be thought expedient to carry it out; but I wish to repeat that, in my opinion, the law as it exists is sufficient to overcome the crime under consideration, if the law be vigorously administered, and that the real defect at present is the hesitation of Magistrates to send cases to be tried at the assizes upon charges of wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm, or assaulting and doing actual bodily harm, when the facts would justify convictions on those charges. The Magistrates deal summarily with such cases, and pass sentence as if the facts did not make out the more serious crimes. And if the power of flogging were given to Judges in cases tried before them, the Magistrates might deal summarily with the cases, just as they do now. If the Magistrates decide rightly on the facts, the punishments they inflict are adequate. The present defect is the dealing by the Magistrates with the facts with too much indulgence.

I am, &c.

(Signed) WM. BALIOL BRETT.

No. 10.

Mr. Justice Grove to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart, M P.

Sir,

November 25, 1874.

I regret that your letter of the 14th instant was by mistake put aside with some circulars, and only reached my hand on the 23rd instant.

I have given my best attention to the subject of the 4th question. I see great difficulty in so framing a statute as to meet exactly what appears to me the cases where corporal punishment is advisable.

I would give the power of ordering it only to the superior judges, and in cases involving baseness, depravity, or cowardly abuse of strength. Thus, in cases of assaults upon young children, of indecent assaults, of unnatural crimes, of unprovoked assaults by men upon women, of assaults which inflict bodily injury, I think a limited power upon conviction by a jury might be given to a judge.

With regard to bodily injury a difficulty of definition arises. Upon indictments for wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm, by the present law juries have the power of finding a verdict of guilty of unlawful wounding, which is subject to a less degree of punishment than the felony, and they generally exercise this option (probably by a compromise among themselves) except in very serious cases indeed.

Therefore, if the punishment of flogging were restricted to cases where grievous bodily harm is inflicted, or to those where injuries are effected, which a jury should find to be with intent to produce grievous bodily harm, in many instances in which flogging might be advisable the finding the minor offence would remove it from the power of the Judge.

It seems to me, therefore, desirable to change the expression, and to use some such expression as inflicting bodily harm or wounding with intent to inflict bodily harm or personal injury.

Language has hitherto failed to give unexceptional definitions of offences admitting of degree, and much must be left to the discretion of the Judge. The test in the Judge's mind should I think be, does the offence of which the prisoner is convicted deserve a degrading punishment? but I know of no means of accurately defining such offence.

I have nothing to suggest as to the other questions further than in so far as what I have written may have on Question 1. As to Question 5 I have not had sufficient opportunities of judging, but what I have heard leads me to believe that flogging has had a preventive effect.

I have, &c.
(Signed) W. R. GROVE.

No. 11.

Mr. Justice Denman to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

Sir,

11, Palace Gate, Kensington, November 7, 1874.

In answer to your letter of the 15th ultimo, and to the questions therein put to me, I give the following answers:—

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence does not appear to me to be deficient. There is hardly any case of an assault, accompanied by brutal violence, in which an indictment may not be framed carrying with it in case of conviction a very long sentence of penal servitude. If assaults of the character supposed have been too leniently dealt with, and sometimes even treated as common assaults, and summarily dealt with at Petty Sessions as such, I ascribe this not to the insufficient stringency of the *penal* law, but either to the want of a public prosecutor to insure the prosecution of the delinquent *for the real offence* of which he has been guilty, or to too great a leniency in the discretion exercised by Judges and Chairmen of Quarter Sessions *in such cases*.

2. I think it would be desirable to render it compulsory on Magistrates at Petty Sessions, wherever they consider that an assault has been accompanied by brutal violence, or serious injury (the phraseology of an enactment must, of course, be carefully considered), to send the case for trial by a jury.

3. I see no objection to increasing the maximum *fine*, but I think it undesirable to increase the term of *imprisonment*, to be imposed by Courts of summary jurisdiction.

4. I have grave doubts whether the punishment of flogging should be authorised in any case. If the offence is one of so brutal a character as to suggest the propriety of flogging, it appears to me that it *must* be of such a character as to warrant penal servitude. I think that if the penalty of flogging were usually to be inflicted in such cases, public sentiment would not go along with a severe flogging, *followed* by penal servitude. On the other hand I believe that flogging and *imprisonment*, in such cases, as a *substitute* for penal servitude, would be utterly inefficient.

One great objection to the infliction of flogging is, that it would be so extremely unequal in its effect, and also in its operation, as regards the different powers of endurance of the criminal and the different constitution of the judges, who would have the discretion of imposing or not imposing it. Moreover, I have much less confidence in that part of our criminal law which resembles the *lex talionis*, than to that which is based upon the consideration of *protecting* innocent people from outrage and wrong.

5. I am not able to say whether the offences referred to in 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., have become rarer, or, if so, whether that is in consequence of the power to flog thereby conferred. I have myself tried more than one prisoner for offences of that description, who had been flogged and imprisoned by other Judges since the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., and as far as I could judge they did not seem agreeably surprised when I gave them long periods of penal servitude, but the contrary.

I believe I am in a minority among my brethren, and that most of them are of opinion that an extension of the power of flogging to certain cases not now provided for in that way, would be desirable. But in any case I would suggest that great care should be taken not so to legislate as to make a flogging *a matter of course* in *all* cases of assaults with violence. Such legislation would, I think, inevitably defeat its own object, and soon tend to making the law and its administrators hateful, not only to confirmed criminals, but to the lower orders generally; and thus be productive of very great mischief.

I have, &c.
(Signed) GEORGE DENMAN.

From Court of Exchequer.

No. 12.

Lord Chief Baron Kelly to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

8, Connaught Place, November 27, 1874.

I beg to apologise for not having before replied to your letter of the 15th October, but the pressure of many occupations, chiefly judicial, has rendered an earlier reply impracticable.

To the 1st and 4th questions I answer that in my opinion the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults and indecent assaults, is not sufficiently stringent, and should be amended by a legislative measure, conferring upon the judges of the Superior Courts authority to inflict flogging in all cases of brutal violence, whether committed upon men, women, or children. I think, however, that no such authority should be conferred upon the judges or magistrates presiding over or constituting any other tribunals. I would add, in reference to this subject, that I entertain a strong opinion that the magistrates throughout England should be instructed or recommended by the Secretary of State to make every practicable effort with the aid of police and otherwise to put the law in force against drunkenness, as in many cases actually causing, and in many more accompanying, the commission of these offences; and which is often treated by juries, and even occasionally by judges, as partially excusing or palliating the offence committed.

2. It is difficult to draw the line between the degrees and the kinds of violence which should be triable only by the superior Judges, and offences of such a nature that they may be safely left to inferior tribunals. But I think that the Secretary of State by a Circular letter to all magistrates might well suggest or advise that in all cases of violence, where the offence seems deserving of more than a few months' imprisonment, the accused should be committed for trial at the Central Criminal Court or the Assizes. I am not aware of any cases requiring a distinction between Quarter Sessions and other benches or meetings of magistrates.

3. I think that the maximum fine and the maximum term of imprisonment, which may be imposed for assaults by Courts of summary jurisdiction, may well be extended.

5. I think that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. It seems indeed to have virtually put an end to garrotting.

I have, &c.

(Signed) FITZROY KELLY.

No. 13.

Baron Bramwell to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

Court of Exchequer, Westminster, November 4, 1874.

I must preface my answer to the questions put in Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson's letter of October 15, by saying that I cannot pretend to any particular qualification to give advice on the subject they refer to. The criminal cases that come before the Judges of the Superior Courts are those they try at the Old Bailey and Assizes, and are mostly of a more serious character than the cases referred to in the question. For example, we rarely have a case of common assault. When we do, it is because some intent charged is not proved. And the cases of wounding we try, are wounding with intent to murder, do grievous bodily harm, and the like. But, answering to the best of my ability, I say,—

1st. I think the law is not sufficiently stringent, and that it would be a good thing to inflict corporal punishment by flogging in the cases referred to in the question. I understand the question not to include such a case as a prize fight or assault for the purpose of some crime, as rape or robbery. My opinion is that, in such cases as put in the question, there should be a power of retaliation, a power of inflicting similar pain on the offender, a power to flog. The question is a delicate one. I have known judges so opposed to flogging as to refuse to inflict it in any case. I think this wrong, and contrary to their duty. I mention it to show the strength of the feeling. It is also

certain that the infliction of such punishments has a tendency to render indifferent to suffering those who inflict them (the executioners), and, to some extent the public, which knows and gets familiarised with them. But I cannot but think there are more than countervailing considerations. In the first place I believe flogging is a most efficacious deterrent. The judge has no means of knowing as such the effect of the punishment he orders; but from all I hear and read, I believe flogging to be a most efficacious punishment. I have been told, and believe, that crimes of violence have been rife in a town; that a judge has been at the Assize for the county in which the town is, who deemed it his duty to order, and did order flogging; that crimes of that character nearly ceased; that a discontinuance of the punishment caused them to be renewed, till the punishment was repeated, with the same result. This in itself is a good thing. And I am by no means sure that if flogging was persisted in in such cases, it would not have a humanising influence. I believe it would. I believe a crime branded in this way by the reprobation of the law and of public opinion, would soon become odious, that there would be a prejudice against it as there is against a foul blow and stabbing. I may observe that I think stabbing cases are not sufficiently punished. I am of opinion that there should be a power of flogging in cases of brutal assault.

2nd. I know of none. But I do not think it desirable that flogging should be ordered on a summary conviction. I think, considering the feeling some people have against it, that it should only follow on the verdict of a Jury. The way to arrange this is, not to take away jurisdiction in any class of cases, but to leave it, as at present, to the magistrates to convict summarily, or send to the Assizes or Quarter Sessions, and give the Assizes and Quarter Sessions a power of ordering flogging.

3rd. I think the maximum term of imprisonment should not be extended. I think the maximum fine should be. It is absurd to fine a man of great wealth 5%. I would extend the amount to 50%.

4th. I have mainly answered this question. I would authorise flogging in all cases of cruelty, in all cases of brutal violence, except those to which the sufferer consented, as in a prize-fight. Some nicety of definition or description would be required.

5th. I have already answered this question. To the best of my knowledge I believe it has. It has diminished the number of such offences. No punishment can do more than that. Nothing can extinguish crime.

I have answered the questions put, but I wish to add that I would inflict flogging in other cases than those suggested, *e.g.*, assaults to commit rape, or robbery, stack firing.

I have, &c.

(Signed) G. BRAMWELL.

No. 14.

Baron Pigott to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

Court of Exchequer, November 16, 1874.

In reply to the letter of Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson of the 15th ultimo, asking for my views upon the points suggested in the five questions therein stated, I have to say, to the first question, that in my opinion the law in cases of assaults with brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent.

To the second and third questions I have no observations to offer.

To that fourthly put, I answer, that I think in all cases of felony or attempts to commit felony, accompanied by brutal violence and intending to cause and causing actual bodily harm to any person, there should be a power given, upon a conviction (expressly finding these facts), to order flogging as part of the sentence.

But I am strongly opposed to this power being given to any other Courts than those which now exercise it under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. It should be regarded as an exceptional punishment; and I believe it to be carefully and even sparingly administered now, because it is by a single judge who feels the responsibility to rest with himself.

This would not be so to the same extent at Quarter Sessions, where the responsibility is divided among many magistrates, and I think it undesirable that it should be applied too commonly.

I have to add, however, that I think the number of strokes permitted to be given should not exceed thirty at any one time.

In practice, more than 25 are seldom ordered, and they are found sufficient as a punishment; any excess being, in my opinion, cruel and dangerous to health.

To your fifth question, I cannot doubt that flogging has been efficacious. No one, who has upon several occasions had to pass this sentence, could help being struck with the evident terror in which flogging is universally regarded by all classes of persons.

I am sure it alarms prisoners and strikes the audience more than any term of penal servitude.

I am, &c.

(Signed) G. PIGOTT.

No. 15.

Baron Pollock to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

Sir,

The Croft, Putney, November 16, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th October with reference to the more effectual suppression of crime of violence, and to give the following answers to the questions asked therein:—

1. In my opinion the existing penal law is not in this respect sufficiently stringent, and I think it should be amended as proposed in my answer to question 4.

2 and 3. It is not in my opinion desirable that any change should be made in the law referred to by these questions.

4. I think flogging should be authorised in all cases of assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm, and where the person assaulted was a woman or child in cases of assault occasioning actual bodily harm. I do not think it would be desirable to authorise flogging for indecent assault.

5. Flogging has, in my judgment, been efficacious in putting down these offences. Before I had experience as a judge I was not in favour of flogging, nor did I believe in its efficacy. I have now been five Circuits in the Northern and Midland Counties, and from what I have seen and heard in Court, and also from what I have gathered in conversation with magistrates, governors of prisons, and others, I am thoroughly satisfied that the practice of flogging has worked well and gone far to put an end to systematic robberies with violence.

I have, &c.

(Signed) CHARLES E. POLLOCK.

No. 16.

Baron Cleasby to the Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P.

20, Queen Anne's Gate, St. James's Park, S.W.,

November 16, 1874.

Sir,

In answer to the five questions put to me in your letter of the 15th October, with reference to the punishment of brutal assaults, I beg to answer as follows:—

1. The proper answer to this question appears to me to be that in all cases of assaults causing grievous bodily harm, if the injury was done with the intent to cause grievous bodily harm, the offence is now punishable with penal servitude for life by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 18; and if the grievous bodily harm was inflicted without such intent, the offence may still be punished with penal servitude for five years by the effect of that Statute, in sec. 20, and the subsequent Statute, 27 & 28 Vict. c. 47. s. 2. Indeed, there is, by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47, in cases of assaults causing actual bodily harm (with the word grievous) a liability to be punished with penal servitude.

In respect of assaults which do not produce bodily harm, I should not be disposed to make the punishment more stringent.

2. It would be difficult to draw the line as a strict one. If the case would come within the first class mentioned in answer to No. 1, the magistrate would, no doubt, send it to the Assizes. If the case was one where actual bodily harm was caused, the magistrate would have to determine whether there was actual bodily harm to that extent if his jurisdiction was limited; and I think it better, therefore, to leave it to his discretion.

3. I should be loth to enlarge the extent to which fine or imprisonment may be summarily imposed.

4. Flogging having received the sanction of the Legislature, and being, as far as I can see, not disapproved of, but, on the contrary, generally approved of, I see no objection

to its being extended where the opinion and feelings of juries and the public would go along with the extension.

As regards assaults upon women, I should not like to have flogging as a punishment in the case of a wife. It would embitter the relation, and make reconciliation impossible.

And it appears ridiculous to impose it generally as regards the case of assaults on women and except the case of a wife. Therefore, as regards assaults upon women, I see strong reasons against the power. As regards assaults upon children, particularly of an indecent character, and even rapes upon children, the punishment might be a proper one.

As regards Question 5, I believe the punishment of flogging has been effectual to a considerable extent in preventing injurious violence in highway robberies.

I am, &c.

(Signed) A. CLEASBY.

No. 17.

Baron Amphlett to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart, M.P.

Sir,

32, Wimpole Street, W., November 14, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 15th ultimo, requesting me to state my views with reference to the points raised in the five questions therein contained, and I will proceed to do so, taking the questions in the same order in which they are stated.

1. I am of opinion that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is sufficiently stringent, except that I would in some cases, as more fully stated below in the answer to the fourth question, authorise flogging in addition to whatever other punishment the offender is subjected to by law.

2. I think that no assault ought to be summarily dealt with which is of such an aggravated character that it cannot, in the opinion of the justices, whether inflicted upon a male or female, be sufficiently punished under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 42., that is to say, by imprisonment for two months, or a fine of 5*l*. This would involve the repeal of the 43rd section of the last-mentioned Act, which, I think, would be very desirable on two grounds:—first, because, as it stands, it tempts magistrates to adjudicate upon cases which had much better be tried at Assizes or Quarter Sessions; and, secondly, because, in my opinion, no man ought to be subjected to so severe a sentence as six months' imprisonment with hard labour without the intervention of a jury, or at least without the right of appeal.

3. I think it is not desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed of Courts of Summary jurisdiction should be extended. In fact, as will be seen above, I should like to see the extension given by the 43rd section taken away, at least without a right to appeal is given.

4. I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised, in all cases tried at Assizes involving the unlawful and malicious infliction of grievous bodily harm, whether felonies or misdemeanors, and whether causing death or not. Such an authority, however, ought to be exercised with extreme care and discretion, and I shall be very unwilling to entrust it either to the Petty or Quarter Sessions, but I would enable the committing magistrate, or the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, to remit any case which he may think deserves a sentence of flogging to be tried at the Assizes. The dread of having their cases so remitted would, I think, have a very deterrent effect upon offenders.

I see no reason for confining such flogging to assaults on women and children.

5. I have no doubt whatever, but that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

(Signed) R. PAUL AMPHLETT.

From Scotch Judges.

No. 18.

The Scotch Judges to Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.

Sir, Edinburgh, November, 1874.

In replying to the questions contained in your communication of the 15th of October, it is necessary to explain that in Scotland the powers of the Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction in awarding punishment rest to a large extent on common law, not on specific statute. In particular, the High Court and Circuit Courts of Justiciary, and even inferior Courts had, at common law, and were in use to exercise, the power of sentencing offenders to the punishment of whipping; and although this punishment has rarely of late been inflicted, a sentence of the kind was pronounced by the Circuit Court of Justiciary as recently as in 1833.

By the Prisons Act (Scotland) 23 & 24 Vict. c. 105. s. 74. any judge or magistrate is declared to be competent to adjudge whipping as a punishment in the case of juvenile offenders under the age of fourteen. But by 25 & 26 Vict. c. 18. it is enacted that in Scotland no offender above the age of sixteen shall be sentenced to be whipped for theft, or for any crime against person or property. The effect of this provision was substantially to render the common law power of the Court of Justiciary in this respect inefficacious.

The Statute 26 & 27 Vict. s. 44. which is referred to in your communication, is, in terms, a general Statute. But as it applies only to convictions under specific sections of the Larceny Act (24 & 25 Vict. c. 96.), and of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and as those Statutes do not apply to Scotland, the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. cannot receive effect in the Scottish Courts.

With these explanations, we reply to the questions put to us as follows:—

1 and 4. We are of opinion that, in so far as it applies to the Superior Courts of Justiciary, the restriction in regard to the age of offenders contained in the 2nd section of the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 18. should be repealed in cases of assaults on women and children, and in the class of crimes corresponding to those provided for in 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. As regards the inferior Courts, and in other respects, we think that no alteration of the law on this head is required.

2. In Scotland the Public Prosecutor has the power of directing whether any particular offence should be tried before the Sheriff summarily, or before the Sheriff with a jury, or before the Court of Justiciary. No legislation on this subject seems to be required.

3. We think the period for which the Sheriff is authorised to imprison, in his summary jurisdiction, should be extended from sixty days to three months. We do not recommend any such extension in the case of other inferior Courts.

5. We have answered this question by anticipation.

We have, &c.

(Signed) JOHN INGLIS, Lord Justice General.
MONCREIFF, Lord Justice Clerk.
GEO. DEAS.
JAS. CRAUFURD.
CHARLES NEAVES, Lord Neaves.
DAVID MURE.
G. YOUNG.

From Chairmen of Quarter Sessions.

CAMBRIDGE.

REPLY to QUESTIONS put by the SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT in his Circular to Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, dated 15 October 1874.

1. I would add flogging, for men with the cat, for boys under 16 with a birch-rod, in assaults of special brutality.
2. None occur to me.
3. Yes, with an appeal to Quarter Sessions.
4. Answered at No. 1., but I would add a flogging for boys under 16 guilty of indecent assaults, or attempts to commit unnatural crimes.
5. Without doubt.

That the age for flogging boys should be enlarged to 16, but that it be limited to the birch-rod.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ARTHUR SPERLING,
Vice-chairman of Quarter Sessions for Cambridgeshire,
Lattenbury Hall, St. Ives, Huntingdonshire,
December 4, 1874.

CARNARVON.

Sir,

Carnarvon, January 23, 1875.

Steps having been taken, in pursuance of your circular letter of the 15th October last, for the purpose of ascertaining the views of the magistrates of this county, with regard to the points raised in the following questions, on the subject of crimes of violence, I beg to transmit to you the following replies:—

1. With the exception of assaults accompanied with brutal violence the law, as it at present stands, is considered sufficiently stringent; but where brutal violence is used, it is suggested that magistrates should be empowered to order flogging in addition to the present penalty.

2. No.

3. Yes. The magistrates would suggest that the power of imprisonment should be extended to six months.

4. Yes. The magistrates would suggest that flogging should be adopted in cases of assaults upon women and children, and for assaults accompanied by brutal violence.

5. Yes. It is believed flogging has been highly efficacious.

I am, &c.

(Signed) NEWBOROUGH,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the County of Carnarvon.

CHESTER.

Sir,

Brighton, December 31, 1874.

Your circular of the 15th October last reached me after the termination of the October Quarter Sessions. I was therefore unable to take the opinion of the court on the various questions to which the Secretary of State for the Home Department requested a reply. I therefore directed the clerk of the peace to forward copies of his letter to the 23 Petty Sessions in the county. I have the honour now to enclose the replies of 21 made out for your convenience in a tabulated form. I will send the remaining two as soon as they are forwarded to me.

I have, &c.

(Signed) EGERTON J. FALTON,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions, County of Chester.

REPLIES FROM CLERKS OF PETTY SESSIONS, with opinions of Justices.

ALTRINCHAM DIVISION.

1. In cases of aggravated and brutal assaults the power to order whipping should be given.

2. Consider that present powers sufficient; to send for trial cases of assault which justices think desirable.

3. Yes; to 10*l*. and costs and imprisonment to three months, also for defendant to find sureties, and justices to have power to order defendant to pay compensation not exceeding 5*l*.

4. Yes, in assaults on women and children, but after verdict by a jury.

5. Justices consider so.

BROXTON.

No return.

BUCKLOW.

1. Think the period of imprisonment should be extended.

2. Think not.

3. Yes; think that the summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. Yes.

5. No evidence in this respect before the Justices of this division.

CHESTER CASTLE.

The Justices of this division consider it desirable that courts of Assize and Sessions should, after prisoners have been convicted by a jury of brutal assaults on females, or of rape or attempt to commit a rape on girls under 10 years, be empowered to order flogging in addition to the other punishments to which such offenders are now liable. They do not consider it would be desirable to authorise Justices in Petty Sessions to order flogging, nor do they think any extension is necessary in the amount of fine or imprisonment that Justices out of sessions are now authorised to impose for assaults.

DARESBUY.

1. Think the power of ordering flogging should be given to Justices in Petty Sessions.

2. Think not.

3. Think that both the maximum fine and term of imprisonment should be extended.

4. See reply No. 1.

5. Yes.

EDDISBURY.

Circular laid before Justices, but they did not instruct their clerk, he writes to say, to write to the clerk of the peace thereon, as they thought the subject would be discussed at the Quarter Sessions.

HYDE.

Justices are of opinion that all charges of assaults, of brutal violence, and indecent assaults should be sent for trial at Sessions, and not dealt with in Petty Sessions, and that on conviction in these cases, and also in cases of rape and violent assaults on women and children, the court should have the power to order flogging.

LEFTWICH.

1. Think the present law sufficiently stringent.

2. They think not.

3. Think there is no necessity to increase fine or term of imprisonment.

4. Think not, by Justices in Petty Sessions.

5. The Justices have no experience of this punishment.

NANTWICH.

No return.

NORTHWICH.

1. Think the law against assaults referred to not sufficiently stringent, but express no opinion.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Think it should in cases of assaults on women and children, but the power to award it to be exercised at Quarter Sessions only.

5. Think it has.

PRESTBURY.

1. That it is not sufficiently stringent, and that additional powers be given to Justices in Petty Sessions to deal with such cases.

2. No, if the above additional power is given.

3 and 4. That the punishment for common assaults be increased to a maximum fine of

20*l.* or imprisonment for six months, and for aggravated assaults on women and children, whether indecent or not, and *all* assaults accompanied by kicking, biting, or the use of weapons of any description be increased to a fine of 50*l.*, or imprisonment for twelve calendar months, with power to the Justices to order a flogging in addition to such imprisonment.

5. They think so.

RUNCORN.

1. Think it is not.
2. Think that there are not.
3. Think that such extension is desirable.
4. That flogging should be authorised, especially for assaults on women and children.
5. Justices are unable to give an opinion.

STOCKPORT.

The magistrates recommend that the provisions of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43. be extended to all aggravated assaults on males of any age, and also to indecent assaults.

2. No; vide the last part of answer 1.
3. Not further than recommended by answer 1.
4. That flogging be authorised where defendant is convicted at Assizes or Quarter Sessions in all cases of violence to the person.
5. The magistrates do not express any opinion.

WIRRAL.

1. Consider that power should be given to the courts to award flogging in cases of assaults of brutal violence.

2. Justices think not.

3. That in cases of aggravated assaults on women and children, the maximum term of imprisonment should be increased from six to twelve months, with the additional power of awarding a flogging, and also a discretionary power to hold the person to bail for a further term of twelve months, and that in cases of assaults of an aggravated character on men, that the maximum term of imprisonment be increased to six months, with the additional power of awarding a flogging, and discretionary power to hold person to bail for six months, and that power to deal summarily with cases of indecent assault and of cutting and wounding should be given to Justices.

4. Views on this question contained in answers 1 and 3.

5. As far as they are able to judge, think flogging has aided in checking these offences.

CORNWALL.

Sir,

Prideaux, Par, Cornwall, October 31, 1874.

In reply to your letter of the 15th inst: I have to state that I have conferred with Sir Charles B. Graves Sawle, Bart., who is like myself one of the chairmen of Quarter Sessions for this county, on the points mentioned in your letter, and in reply thereto have to inform Mr. Secretary Cross, that we think that the penal laws to which the letter refers do require amendment in various particulars:—

1st. We consider that assaults characterised by brutal violence, where the offences are not sent for trial to Assizes or Quarter Sessions, should be punished by the justices in Petty Sessions, by imprisonment for periods not exceeding six months without the option of fines.

2nd. We are not aware of any kind of assaults to which this inquiry relates.

3rd. We think that it is desirable that the maximum fine or term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults, by courts of summary jurisdiction, should be extended both as regards the amount of the fine, and the period of imprisonment.

4th. We are of opinion that flogging should be authorised in all cases for convictions for assaults before a jury, and especially as regards assaults on women and children.

5th. We are happy to state that the offences to which this inquiry relates are entirely unknown in this county.

Should Mr. Secretary Cross wish that these inquiries should be submitted to the magistrates of the county generally, or should he desire any further information in our power, we shall be happy to carry out his wishes.

I have, &c.

(Signed) C. RUSHLEIGH,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Cornwall.

CUMBERLAND.

Sir,

Newby Crange, Carlisle, December 7, 1874.

In reply to your circular of the 15th of October last, requesting my observations and opinion on certain points relative to the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, I have to state that,—

1. In my opinion the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent, and that power should be given to order flogging in certain aggravated cases.

2. Those assaults for which flogging might be ordered should, I think, be triable only at Assizes and Sessions.

3. I do *not* think it desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction, should be extended.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., especially in cases of assaults upon women and children.

5. Flogging has not been tried in the county of Cumberland for offences under the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I am, &c.

(Signed) W. W. HODGSON,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the
county of Cumberland.

DERBY.

Sir,

Allerton Hall, Derby, October 27, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular, which arrived to-day. On another piece of paper I have endeavoured to answer the questions contained in it.

I remain, &c.

(Signed) T. W. EVANS,
County Chairman.

1. Aggravated assaults are now punishable with five years' penal servitude, I think it might not be amiss to raise the maximum to seven years; but I have no strong opinion in favour of this.

2. I think not; justices have the power if they think fit to send aggravated cases to Sessions or Assizes.

3. I think not, bad cases ought to go before a jury.

4. I think flogging should be authorised in the case of aggravated assaults, especially in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. I think that flogging has been very efficacious in checking offences for which it is now authorised.

P.S.—I have just finished the Derbyshire Sessions. Out of 39 prisoners five were charged with aggravated assaults, and two with indecent assaults.

DEVON.

Sir,

The Castle, Exeter, January 18, 1875.

At the last Quarter Sessions for this county, your circular of the 15th October last, requesting observation and opinion on certain points relative to crimes of violence, was laid before the court, and a committee was appointed to consider the questions contained in that circular, with power to report their opinion respecting them direct to you.

The committee have met and given the matter referred to them their earnest consideration, and by their direction I have the honour to transmit their replies to the several questions set forth in your circular.

I have, &c.

(Signed) H. FORD,
Clerk of the Peace.

REPLIES to the QUERIES contained in the Secretary of State's circular of the 15th October 1874, on the subject of the more effectual suppression of crimes of violence.

1. The committee are of opinion that flogging should be extended to assaults of brutal violence.

2. Yes, those cases in which several persons have combined with a view to commit an assault, and have committed one in combination accordingly.

3. There are not unfrequently, under the head of assaults now triable by courts of summary jurisdiction, instances of serious assaults in which the maximum fine, or the maximum term of imprisonment, should be extended, say, the fine to 20*l.*, the imprisonment to six months.

4. Yes (see answer to No. 1), except in case of women and children.

5. In this county, so far as our jurisdiction extends, we have no facts within our personal knowledge on which to found an opinion.

By order of the Committee,

H. FORD,

Clerk of the Peace for Devon.

DORSET.

Sir,

Bryanston, Blandford, Oct. 28, 1874.

Your circular letter dated 15th October on the law of assault did not reach the clerk of the peace until after the 22nd inst., when our Quarter Sessions were concluded, and I have just received it. I can therefore only give you my individual opinion as Chairman of Quarter Sessions, without the aid of the court.

1. It appears to me that 24 & 25 Vict. c. 9. ss. 20 and 21 and 38 are quite sufficient for this purpose and define *brutal* violence, but section 42 is inadequate, inasmuch as therein no cumulative punishment is permitted for repeated offences. The same applies to section 43, and I should advise the Act to be amended, and enforce such cumulative punishment as may not exceed five years' penal servitude.

2. I think none, because the difficulty is to ensure prosecution, which was the reason for the placing summary power in two justices when that law was enacted, as I well remember having taken part in the discussion in Parliament.

3. The maximum in section 42 should be extended to (say) six months.

4. Yes; nothing is so deterrent if it is inflicted *in prison*, not *otherwise*.

5. I have no experience on this point worth attention.

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) PORTMAN.

ESSEX.

Sir,

Ongar, Nov. 18, 1874.

Referring to your circular letter of the 15th of October ult., addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, I beg to enclose the answers of two of our chairmen, each written upon the third side of a copy of the letter above mentioned.

I have not yet received the replies of the other two chairmen; as soon as I do so they shall be forwarded.

I am, &c.

(Signed) H. GIBSON, C.P.

1. No.

2. No.

3. Yes, to 20*l.* fine, or six months' imprisonment with hard labour.

4. I believe that flogging would have a most beneficial effect in cases of brutal assaults, especially on women and children.

5. I believe, from hearsay evidence, that flogging has been very efficacious in putting down crimes of robbery with violence.

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) THOS. KEMBLE.

1. It is sufficiently stringent, and needs no amendment, except as suggested below.

2. The aggravated assaults upon females and boys under 14, now triable at Petty Sessions (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43.), should be made triable at Quarter Sessions, and be punished in the same manner as the infliction of bodily harm (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 20.).

3. No.

4. Flogging might be authorised for aggravated assaults upon females and boys.

5. I have no experience upon this point.

(Signed) J. W. PERRY WATLINGTON,
(One of the Chairmen of the Essex Quarter Sessions).

Sir,

Gaynes Park, Epping, Oct. 29, 1874.

As Chairman of the Essex Quarter Sessions, I send you my answer to the questions addressed to me by Mr. Secretary Cross.

I think that flogging is the best, if not the only, means of repressing brutal assaults on women, children, and *men*, for it is obvious that brutality may be perpetrated against men (the weak, the helpless, or by superior numbers) as well as against the other two classes.

I think, so far as my experience extends, that flogging has been in a great degree efficacious in putting down the various offences for which it has been authorised. The punishment, if not sure and speedy, would lose half its efficacy, by losing half its terror; and I think that the punishment itself (*i.e.*, the decision what assaults *are brutal*), as well as the number of strokes, may be safely left to the discretion of magistrates at Petty Sessions, as well as to judges and justices at Quarter Sessions, with the following safeguard, to be applied equally *in all cases* :—

That the punishment be inflicted only in central gaols, under the personal supervision of the gaol surgeon or his competent substitute, who should at *any* time before or during the punishment have power to diminish (not to increase) the number of strokes, but only on certifying in writing that the criminal is unfit to bear, or that it would be unsafe to inflict more than the diminished number.

I also think that, so far as practicable, a similar instrument should be used, and (perhaps) the punishment be inflicted in each gaol by the same gaoler.

Moreover, this being a new punishment, and one requiring caution in its infliction, it might be well if the Secretary of State, before the commencement of the Act (which should come into operation as soon as possible), were to issue, in the form of a circular to all the Judges and Justices alike, a letter written under experienced advice, which should go beyond the bare letter of the Act, and serve in some measure as a guide and warning as to the best method of administering the Statute.

So far as the Constitution does not interfere, I see no reason why the Act should not be operative throughout the empire.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. C. CHISENHALE-MARSH,
Senior Chairman of Essex Quarter Sessions.

HEREFORD.

Sir,

Perrystone, Ross, Herefordshire, Dec. 19, 1874.

Herewith I send answers to your questions from magistrates assembled in Petty Sessions in this county. Those from the Ross Petty Sessions contain my views, with this difference, that I think corporal punishment should be inflicted only after conviction at Assizes or Quarter Sessions.

I wish to add that I do not see why there should be any distinction as to the procedure under sections 1 and 3 of the Criminal Justice Act; the prisoner might, as I think, have the option of making a defence under section 3 as well as under section 1, electing to have his case settled under section 3 as well as under section 1.

I remain, &c.

(Signed) GEORGE CLIVE,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions.

BROMYARD.

The Magistrates of the Bromyard Petty Sessional Division, in the county of Hereford, are of opinion that—

1. In the cases of brutal assaults the punishment of flogging should be added, but that such cases should be remitted to Quarter Sessions. To make the third offence of aggravated assault a felony.

2. Only as regards the above alterations.

3. The fines and imprisonments may be increased with advantage.

4. Justices should have power to order boys under 16 to be whipped for all offences now punishable on summary conviction.

5. It appears to have been beneficial.

The Magistrates append the following suggestions :—

1. To extend the summary jurisdiction of Justices to all cases of embezzlement, false pretences, and receiving stolen property.

2. To take the plea under the Criminal Justice Act before the depositions are taken.

3. To allow proof of summonses by affidavit.

4. To allow magistrates' summonses to have jurisdiction beyond the jurisdiction of the magistrates who issued them.

5. To allow Justices' warrants, unbacked, to be executed anywhere in England.

6. To give Justices power to commit in contempt of court.

7. To give Justices power to order costs against defendants in cases of complaint for sureties of the peace or good behaviour.

8. To give Justices power to order recognizances by both parties in case of breach of the peace.

9. To provide a summary process for estreating recognizances.

10. To make the records of petty sessions evidence.

11. To give power to award penalties or portion of penalties to complainants.

12. Further power to punish a drunkard after the second conviction within 12 months.

13. To extend the crime of petty larceny to the taking fruit from the trees, as well as when it has been previously picked.

14. To make every malicious trespass punishable by fine or imprisonment on summary conviction.

(Signed) W. P. HOPTON,
Chairman of the Bromyard Bench of Magistrates.

BREDWARDINE.

QUESTIONS submitted to the JUSTICES of this PETTY SESSIONAL DIVISION and their REPLIES thereto.

1. We are of opinion that two Justices should have the power to inflict a penalty not exceeding 10*l.*, or to imprison with hard labour for not exceeding six calendar months, and to inflict, as part of the punishment, flogging to be administered in the county gaol in all cases of assault with brutal violence.

2. We think not.

3. Yes, see answer to first question.

4. Yes; we think flogging in gaol, in addition to imprisonment, should be authorised in all cases of assault, with brutal violence, more especially in the cases of assaults on women and children.

5. We think it has, but we have never had occasion to sentence any person to be flogged under the statute referred to.

Signed by order of the justices,
G. W. PAGE,
Clerk to the Justices.

WEOBLEY.

Petty Sessions, Weobly, November 23, 1874.

We, the undersigned Magistrates assembled at Petty Sessions, have come to an unanimous opinion, in answer to the accompanying questions.

1. We are of opinion that the penal law is not sufficiently stringent, and we recommend that flogging be added at the discretion of the Magistrates at Quarter Sessions.

2. We are of opinion that assaults of brutal violence now summarily punished, should be triable only at Assizes and Quarter Sessions.

3. Referring to our answer No. 2, we are of opinion that it is not desirable that the maximum fine or term of imprisonment should be extended.

4. We are of opinion that flogging should be authorised, especially in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. We are not in position to give any answer.

(Signed) HENRY G. COTTERELL (Chairman).
D. P. PEPLOE.
BECKELEIGH S. STANHOPE.
T. REAVELY.
J. CLOWES.

HAREWOOD END.

At a meeting of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the Petty Sessional Division of Harewood End, held at the magistrates' room, Harewood End, in the county of Hereford, the 24th day of November 1874, to take into consideration the circular sent out by Mr. Secretary Cross as to the more effectual repression of the crimes of violence, the following answers to the questions contained in the said circular were agreed to:—

1. Cases sometimes occur of violent and aggravated assaults on aged and infirm men; we are of opinion that in such cases Justices should have the same powers as in section 43, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 94. of awarding imprisonment "for any period not exceeding six months, or a fine not exceeding (together with costs) twenty pounds."

2. We are not of opinion that it is desirable that any cases of assault now dealt with summarily, should be declared only triable by a jury.

3. Only as far as extending the powers of section 43 to assaults committed on men, as well as for assaults on women and children. We are of opinion that Justices should have the power of awarding pecuniary compensation to complainants by way of costs payable by defendant, the consequence of such assaults frequently being the loss of wages, and of medical attendance.

4. We are of opinion that in cases of aggravated and brutal assaults on females (and children under a certain age), Justices should have increased jurisdiction, and be empowered to sentence at Petty Sessions persons found guilty of such offences to a limited amount of corporal punishment in addition to imprisonment, such corporal punishment to be carried out in some gaol or house of correction by the officers of the prison. We are of opinion that a brutally minded coward dreads nothing so much as the infliction of pain on his own person, and that there are men whom no punishment will deter but that of the lash. And we recommend that Justices should have the power of awarding it at Petty Sessions, because the effect of such punishment is greater the sooner it can follow the offence for which it is awarded. Quarter Sessions might have more extensive powers in such cases as Justices might think it desirable to send for trial.

5. We have had no experience in our county of the infliction of flogging under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

We suggest that costs and expenses, including compensation, payable in the event of defendant going to gaol in default of paying the penalty, &c. should not be recovered by orders on overseers of the poor, but from the county treasurer.

(Signed) EDWARD JONES.
W. BASKERVILLE MYNORS.

ABBYDORE.

Abbydore Petty Sessions, Nov. 9, 1874.

1. The penal law on assaults as administered by Petty Sessions appears to us sufficiently stringent. Grave cases may be sent for trial at Quarter Sessions, who in case of brutal assaults or assaults on women and children should have power to order flogging.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Yes, in cases tried by Quarter Sessions.

5. We have no experience in such cases.

(Signed) ARCHER CLIVE.
THEBE LEWIS.

LEOMINSTER.

Repression of Crimes of Violence.

Dear Sir,

Leominster, December 7, 1874.

The Magistrates of the Leominster Division on Friday last considered the circular sent by the Secretary of State referring to the above. The Magistrates agreed that *flogging* should be inflicted for all assaults of brutal violence, but they did not wish to have the power of ordering such flogging themselves, which power they considered should alone be vested in Judges of Assize or Quarter Sessions.

Several of the Magistrates, however, thought that the punishment of "*whipping*" should be extended in the case of juvenile offenders to other offences, such as petty depredations, mischievous injuries, &c. (instead of being confined as it is at present under the Juvenile Offenders Act to *theft*), and it was thought that in such cases magistrates should have the power of ordering such whipping to be inflicted.

The Chairman, J. H. Arkwright, Esq., was unable to be present at the meeting.

I sent him a copy of this letter and he will, I believe, write you with his own individual opinion, which I have reason to believe is as the other Magistrates have come to.

I am, &c.
(Signed) H. MOORE.

LEDBURY.

1. So far as this district is concerned the present law is sufficient for the purpose, but I think there have been cases elsewhere in which flogging would have been beneficial.

2. Certainly not. I think in cases of assault justice is better done summarily. Great expenses are incurred, and I have known many cases where injustice has been done from the facts of the case being imperfectly brought before the Superior Court. Two notable cases I could mention, though not of assault.

3. I think not.

4. Yes, I think it might be well added to cases of burglary where personal violence is offered or even threatened. Aged persons or women may receive no personal injury, but terror may produce permanent mental injury.

5. It is generally believed so; the offence has almost ceased and offenders themselves have expressed horror of it.

KINGTON.

Dear Sir, Titley Court, Titley, Herefordshire, December 11, 1874.

I am sorry I have not been able to send you sooner the opinion of the Kington bench as to the questions of Mr. Secretary Cross, which is as follows:—

1 and 2. Assaults of brutal violence are scarcely known in this retired district, but we think they may properly be made indictable and triable at assizes or Quarter Sessions instead of Petty Sessions.

3. The maximum of fine and of imprisonment may properly be extended in some instances, leaving it to the discretion of the Magistrates when that should be.

4. The punishment of flogging may be properly extended in gross cases, but this power should only be given to the Assizes or Quarter Sessions.

5. We can give no answer, having had no experience.

I am, &c.
(Signed) C. W. GRIMSBY.

WIGMORE.

Sir, Wigmore, Herefordshire, December 1, 1874.

In answer to Mr. Secretary Cross' circular of October 15, 1874, we, the Magistrates present at the Wigmore Petty Sessions this day, are of opinion:—

1. That the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent, and that it should be amended by authorising the infliction of flogging.

2. That assaults with brutal violence should be tried at Quarter Sessions.

3. That there is no necessity for increasing the maximum fine or maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed by Petty Sessional Courts, if cases of violent assault are referred to Quarter Sessions.

4. That flogging in cases of brutal violence, especially in cases of assault on women and children, should be authorised.

5. On this point we have no local experience.

We are, &c.
(Signed) A. R. BOUGHTON, Knight.
C. T. FRANKLIN.

HEREFORD.

Dear Clive, Sufton Court, near Hereford, November 17, 1874.

Our Petty Sessional bench having considered the questions proposed by the Home Secretary, I now forward to you in answer, as requested, the result of our deliberations thereon.

Believe me, &c.
(Signed) RD. HEREFORD.

REPLIES of JUSTICES acting for the Petty Sessional Division of Hereford to questions contained in a letter from the Home Secretary, dated October 15, 1874.

1. We think it may be judiciously amended by giving the additional powers referred to in the answer to question No. 4.

2. We think not.

3. We do not think that the class of assaults occurring in this district requires any extension of the power to punish upon summary conviction.

4. We think that Courts of Assize and Quarter Sessions should have power to punish by flogging and penal servitude in all cases of aggravated assault, whether upon males, females, or children.

5. No offence under this section has occurred in this district, and we have, therefore, had no practical experience of the efficiency of the punishment of flogging in the cases referred to; but we are of opinion that it has worked well, and that the power of inflicting it should be retained.

(Signed) RD. HEREFORD,
Chairman.

Ross.

Dear Clive,

Thursday.

What I referred to with respect to the Criminal Justice Act I have put on the inner page. I do not see why the procedure under sections 1 and 3 might not be made similar, giving the prisoner his option of making a defence in section 3. I do not know if you will see it in the same light as I do.

Yours truly,
(Signed) K. M. POWER.

Under section 3, 18 & 19 Vict. c. 126., a person charged with larceny, the property being above the value of 5s., &c. &c., and the Justices think on the evidence (for the prosecution) that this is a case to put prisoner on his trial, they are (without hearing any defence he may wish to make) to ask if he pleads guilty; if he does not, they have apparently no option of going further into the case, but must send him for trial. Whereas if the prisoner had an option of making a defence, the evidence of the prosecution might fall to the ground, and the Justices might be able to dismiss the prisoner without the expense of a trial and probable acquittal.

By section 3 the prisoner cannot elect to have his case settled as by section 1, or disprove the charge. If the Justices could hear any defence or witnesses he might call, *after pleading not guilty* as in section 1, it possibly might save the necessity of a committal. If the prisoner objected to make a defence he would be committed as a matter of course.

I think cases under the value of 5s. the prisoner should not have the option provided in section 1.

If a man steals ten shillings worth of apples *growing* he may be treated summarily, or if he stole one of your pines, which latter would be a greater offence than taking two pennyworth of wheat.

At a meeting of the Justices acting for the Ross Petty Sessional Division, in the county of Hereford, held on Friday, November 20, 1874, for the purpose of taking into consideration certain questions submitted by Mr. Secretary Cross relating to the more effectual suppression of the crimes of violence,

It was resolved that the following replies to the questions be returned:—

1. We are of opinion that Justices should have power to inflict in Petty Sessions the same penalties for violence and aggravated assaults on men as they now have for aggravated assaults on women and children under section 43 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 94. (not exceeding six months' imprisonment, or 20*l.* penalty).

2. We think not.

3. Only as far as extending the powers of section 43, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 94. to aggravated assaults on men. And we think that Justices should have the power of ordering pecuniary compensation to complainants in cases where the assaults have been the cause of loss of wages, or expense for medical attendance.

4. We are of opinion that in cases of *brutal* and aggravated assaults on women and children, Justices should have increased summary jurisdiction, and be empowered to sentence persons found guilty of such offences to a limited amount of *corporal punishment* in addition to imprisonment, such corporal punishment to be forthwith carried out in some gaol or house of correction by the prison officers.

We are led to form this opinion from the belief that there are many men of a savage and brutal nature who no other punishment will deter but the fear of the lash. And

we recommend that Justices should have the power of awarding it at Petty Sessions, because the effect of such punishment is greater the sooner it can follow the offence for which it is awarded.

We think that Quarter Sessions might have more extended powers in such cases as Justices might think desirable to send for trial.

5. We have had no experience of flogging under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. in this county. But we are satisfied that the infliction has tended to diminish, if not altogether to suppress, the description of offences for which it is inflicted.

We would further suggest that costs and expences, including compensation if awarded, payable in the event of defendant going to gaol in default of paying the penalty, &c. should not be recoverable by orders on overseers of the poor out of money levied for poor rate, but by orders on the county treasurer out of the county rate.

(Signed) K. MANLEY POWER.
E. B. HAWKSHAW.
WILLIAM HULME.
GEO. STRONG.

HERTFORDSHIRE.

Sir, Clerk of the Peace Office, St. Albans, Herts, December 15, 1874.

Your letter of inquiry of the 15th October last, having been by an order of Court of Michaelmas Quarter Sessions last referred to the Visiting Justices of the gaol of the liberty of St. Alban, in order that they might consider the same, and report thereon to the Home Office, I am directed by the Visiting Justices to forward for the information of the Secretary of State for the Home Department the enclosed report of the committee.

I am, &c.
(Signed) ALFRED GILL,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

Michaelmas Quarter Session, 1874.

A communication from the Home Office was read to the court (communication filed on the roll of this Session), and the same is referred to the Visiting Justices to report thereon to the Home Secretary.

REPORT of the VISITING JUSTICES of the GAOL of the Liberty of Saint Alban, in the County of Herts.

The Visiting Justices of the Gaol of the Liberty of St. Alban have considered the questions referred to them, having regard to the character and circumstances of the population resident in that part of the county of Herts within their jurisdiction, and their answers must be taken as given with reference only to the requirements of such jurisdiction.

The Visiting Justices beg to offer the following suggestions and recommendations in answer to the circular letter from the Home Office of the 15th October 1874:—

1. They are of opinion that Justices in Petty Sessions should have power to inflict the same amount of punishment in cases of assaults upon adult males as they now have under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43. in cases of aggravated assaults upon females and boys under 14 years of age.

2. They believe that the existing state of the law is satisfactory and requires no alteration.

3. Subject to the foregoing reply to question No. 1, the Visiting Justices do not consider that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may now be imposed for assaults by Courts of Summary Jurisdiction need be extended.

4. They would suggest that flogging should be authorised for those acts of violence causing or tending to cause danger to life or bodily harm within the provisions of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 17, 18, 20, 28, and 29, and also in respect of those offences against children referred to in sections 50 and 51 of the same Act.

5. The Visiting Justices have formed no conclusion on this question, no case of flogging under the above-mentioned Act having occurred within their jurisdiction.

In concluding their report the Visiting Justices would submit, for the consideration of the Home Secretary, the following suggestions:—

1. That authority should be given to Magistrates in Petty Sessions to order whipping to be inflicted in cases of indecent or common assault by boys under 16 years of age upon girls under 12 years of age.
2. That whereas under the existing state of the law when children are brought before magistrates charged with offences such as wilful damage to property, and the offence proved is of a nature requiring some punishment, the Bench can only inflict a fine (which they have no power to compel the parents of such child to pay), and in default of payment order such child to be imprisoned.

As children cannot pay a fine, and as parents sometimes refuse to pay, the Visiting Justices would suggest that power should be given to Magistrates in Petty Sessions to compel the payment of such fine by the parents, or, in default, to order some slight corporal punishment to be inflicted on the child, so that imprisonment might be avoided.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,
GEO. R. MARTEN,
Chairman.

HUNTINGDON.

Sir, Stukeley Hall, Huntingdon, November 19, 1874.

I much regret that unavoidable circumstances have prevented my sending an earlier reply to the questions which you submitted to me by the direction of Mr. Secretary Cross, and bearing date October 15.

On the receipt of them I caused a copy to be sent to the Chairman of each of the five Petty Sessional Divisions in this county, with a request that he would submit them to the Justices acting for his division for their consideration, and inform me as to their opinions thereon. The several replies I have received will, as a rule, bear very nearly the same construction, though somewhat varying in terms. I have given them the best consideration in my power, and they seem to me to lead to the following conclusions:—

1. The replies I have received express a decided opinion that the provisions of the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. might well be extended to such cases, but I do not gather from them whether or no it is suggested that Justices in Petty Sessions should be authorised to apply them. A brother magistrate of long experience has expressed a very decided opinion against giving such a power to magistrates in Petty Sessions, and in that opinion, after 37 years' experience, I most fully concur. I think no such extended power should be given till after conviction at Quarter Sessions. I gather, however, from the replies sent to me that the penal law against brutal assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other is not sufficiently stringent, and might be amended by giving authority on conviction at Quarter Sessions for inflicting flogging as laid down in the Act already referred to.

2. None that I am aware of, nor have any been suggested to me.

3. Upon this question I find a difference of opinion. It has been suggested that in aggravated cases both the amount of fine and period of imprisonment might be doubled. It has also been suggested that it would be inexpedient to make any alteration in the existing law. I cannot refrain from submitting that it might be very inexpedient to give authority to a court of Petty Sessions, which might *accidentally* on a day when a case of assault was heard consist of merely two or three young and inexperienced magistrates, to exercise a greater power than justices at present possess. I should prefer that cases in which the penalty or imprisonment should be thought inadequate should be remitted for trial at the Quarter Sessions.

4. See answer to No. 1.

5. Our experience in this county is not sufficient to justify us in expressing any opinion upon this point. And although opinions have been expressed to me in the affirmative, they seem to me to be based upon the reports of what has occurred elsewhere rather than from any personal knowledge. I can only state that I do not know of a single case that has occurred within my experience in this county.

I have, &c.

(Signed) PHILIP SILLARD,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the
County of Huntingdon.

WEST KENT.

Sir,

January 15, 1875.

In answer to your letter of 15th October 1874, asking my opinion on the question of how to deal with crimes of violence, I beg to say that I laid your letter before the Court of General Sessions in October last. It was by them referred to the two committees of visiting justices for Maidstone and St. Augustine's (Canterbury) prisons.

These reports have been handed to me, and I have great pleasure in forwarding them for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross. I may be allowed^d to add, that I entirely concur in the report from the visiting justices of Maidstone prison, to which body I have the honour to belong.

I am, &c.

JOHN G. TALBOT,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions for West Kent.

REPORT of the VISITING JUSTICES of MAIDSTONE PRISON upon the Secretary of State's Circular Letter of the 15th October 1874.

After a due consideration of the questions raised in the Secretary of State's circular of the 15th of October last, addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, and referred to the visiting justices for their opinion thereon, they have come to the following resolutions, viz. :—

1. That the present law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent, and that it should be so amended as to make all such assaults punishable with penal servitude and flogging under the Statute 26 & 27 Vict. cap. 44.

2. That aggravated assaults should be tried only at Assizes and Quarter Sessions.

3. That the maximum fine which may be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction for common assaults should be raised to 10*l*. and costs, and the maximum term of imprisonment to six months.

4. That flogging should be authorised for all cases of brutal violence, and for all assaults upon women and children, causing actual bodily harm.

5. That flogging has been efficacious in putting down offences for which it was authorised by 26 and 27 Vict. c. 44.

That the following clause, suggested by the Clerk of the Peace, would in their opinion carry out the views expressed in the 1st resolution :—

“Whoever shall assault another with brutal violence shall, on conviction or indictment, be liable, at the discretion of the court, to penal servitude for five years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour, and with or without solitary confinement; and if a male, to be whipped under the regulations as to whipping prescribed by the statute 26 and 27 Vict. c. 44. Costs of prosecution shall be allowed as in cases of felony.”

The visiting justices also recommend that power be given to courts of summary jurisdiction to order boys under the age of sixteen to be whipped with a birch rod, with or without imprisonment, for assaults.

HARDINGE.

SAINT AUGUSTINE'S PRISON.

REPORT of VISITING JUSTICES on Crimes of Violence.

1. We think flogging should be added to the present sentences for brutal violence, at the discretion of the judge.

2. Not any.

3. We think it desirable to extend the term of imprisonment to six calendar months.

4. Most decidedly so.

5. Most certainly.

G. WILSON TICHELEWE, Chairman.

CHARLES J. PLUMPTRE.

JOHN KIRKPATRICK.

J. BITTINGTON.

LANCASHIRE.

Sir,

Gateacre, Liverpool, December 11, 1874.

Your letter, dated Whitehall, 15th October 1874, addressed to “the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Lancashire,” and having reference to the measures to be adopted

for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, was, at the sessions held at Kirkdale on the 3rd November, referred to a special committee.

This committee accordingly met on the 2nd inst., and agreed unanimously on a report which, as Acting Chairman of the Sessions, I have the honour to enclose herewith, in the belief that it will be a more useful answer to your letter than any opinion of my own solely could be.

I have, &c.
(Signed) T. P. E. THOMPSON.

Kirkdale Adjourned Quarter Sessions, December 8, 1874.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE appointed at the Kirkdale Quarter Sessions on the 3rd of November last, to take into consideration the letter from the Secretary of State to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions upon the subject of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

Your Committee have to report to the court that they met at Kirkdale on the 2nd day of December instant, and took into consideration the subjects referred to them.

The Committee was of a representative character, one member being elected, in accordance with the resolution of the court, from each of the Petty Sessional Divisions in the hundred of West Derby, in addition to Mr. T. P. E. Thompson, the acting Chairman of Quarter Sessions, and they agreed unanimously to the following answers to the questions put by the Secretary of State, viz.:—

1. No. It should be amended by giving to such courts as the Legislature thinks fit the power of ordering flogging, and also extending the terms of imprisonment.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. In the opinion of this Committee there are several kinds of violence to which the provisions of Statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. should be extended, as well in the cases of assaults on men as upon women and children.

5. In the opinion of this committee *it has*.

(Signed) T. P. E. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

LANCASTER.

My dear Cross,

Wyreside in Lancaster, December 3, 1874.

I have the pleasure of sending you the replies to your circular of the 15th October, also some suggestions as to extending the jurisdiction of magistrates in Petty Sessions. In the former you will find that our recommendations are very similar to those agreed upon at Salford and Preston. We, however, differ from the Salford magistrates as to the latter. Mr. Boggens expressed himself strongly against increasing the powers of Petty Sessions as depriving the public of trial by jury. You will see by our resolutions that though we recommend a considerable extension we still give the prisoner the option of being tried by a jury, therefore we don't deprive him of the privilege upon which Mr. Biggins appears to lay such stress. I'm not an advocate for allowing magistrates in Petty Sessions any extension of punishment beyond six months, which is the present limit, but, as you know, there are hundreds of cases where in Quarter Sessions, and even at Assizes, the punishment does not reach even this, and which cases might be dealt with at Petty Sessions with great advantages as to time and expense. It is very true that if the powers we recommend be granted business at Quarter Sessions will be reduced more than one half, but I say, so much the better. I trust, therefore, you will take our recommendations into your serious consideration. There are many cases of kicking and violent assaults which I think ought to be taken out of the hands of Petty Sessions, and either committed to Quarter Sessions or Assizes, when the punishment in the power of magistrates to inflict is totally inadequate to the offence. I am decidedly against giving magistrates in Petty Sessions the power of whipping.

Believe me, &c.
(Signed) HENRY GARNETT.

At a meeting of the justices of the hundred of Lonsdale, in the county palatine of Lancaster, specially convened for the purpose of taking into consideration the letters from the Secretary of State upon the subject of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, and the amendment of the law relating to the summary jurisdiction of justices of the peace, and held in the Grand Jury Room in Lancaster Castle, on the 14th day of November 1874.

PRESENT :

Henry Garnett, Esq., Chairman.
 Charles Henry Bird, Esq.
 Samuel E. Bolden, Esq.
 Edward Dawson, Esq.
 Thomas Grassyard Edmondson, Esq.
 Edward Matthew Fenwick, Esq.
 John Fell, Esq.
 William Ford, Esq.
 Henry Richmond H. Gale, Esq.

Henry Garnett, Esq., junior.
 Henry Gregson, Esq.
 Thomas Howitt, Esq.
 Rev. Charles T. Royds.
 Edmund Sharpe, Esq.
 J. P. C. Starkie, Esq., M.P.
 Thomas Storey, Esq.
 James Thomson, Esq., and
 George Edward Wilson, Esq.

The justices first took into consideration the letter from the Secretary of State to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions upon the subject of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, and with the view of answering his inquiries they proceeded to consider seriatim the following offences, and whether it was advisable that any, and, if any, what alteration should be made in the punishment for such offences, viz. :—

1. Common assaults.
2. Aggravated assaults upon females and boys under 14.
3. Indecent assaults, and assaults with intent to commit a rape.
4. Unlawfully wounding and inflicting grievous bodily harm.
5. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.
6. Assaults on constables.
7. Assaults with intent to rob.
8. Carnally knowing and abusing girls under 10, and between 10 and 12.
9. Attempts to have carnal knowledge of girls under 12.

1. With regard to common assaults the justices did not consider it necessary or advisable that any alteration should be made in the punishment which can now be inflicted either summarily or at Quarter Sessions for this class of offences.

2. Aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14.

The Justices resolved to recommend that in cases of this nature the summary jurisdiction of Justices in Petty Sessions should be extended as well to all females as all males of whatever age.

3. Indecent assaults and assaults with intent to commit a rape.

These are indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which is at present two years' imprisonment with or without hard labour. The Justices resolved to recommend that the word "without" should be omitted, and that the punishment should be increased to five years' penal servitude, or imprisonment, *with* hard labour, not exceeding two years.

4. Unlawfully wounding, with or without a weapon or instrument, and inflicting grievous bodily harm.

These are also indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which at present is five years' penal servitude or imprisonment for not exceeding two years with or without hard labour. The Justices recommend that *whipping* should be added to the punishment in accordance with the provisions of statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

5. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.

These are also indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which is at present the same as for unlawfully wounding, viz., five years' penal servitude or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Justices recommend that *whipping* should also be added to the punishment in terms of the before-mentioned statute.

6. Assaults on constables in the execution of their duty.

These offences are punishable either summarily or by indictment. The maximum punishment which can be inflicted summarily and which is given by statute 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112. s. 12 is a penalty of 20*l.*, in default of payment six months' imprisonment, or imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labour, or in case the offender has been convicted of a similar assault within two years, nine months'

imprisonment with or without hard labour. The maximum punishment which can now be awarded after conviction upon an indictment is imprisonment not exceeding two years with or without hard labour. The Justices do not recommend any extension of or alteration in the summary jurisdiction, but they recommended that penal servitude for five years be added as an alternative punishment after conviction upon an indictment.

7. Assault with intent to rob.

This is an indictable offence, the maximum punishment for which now is five years penal servitude, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Justices do not recommend any alteration in the punishment for this offence.

8. Carnally knowing and abusing girls under 10, and between 10 and 12.

The first of these offences, viz., "carnally knowing, &c. girls under 10" is a felony, and is only triable at the assizes. The second, viz., "carnally knowing and abusing" girls between 10 and 12" is a misdemeanor triable at the Sessions. The first offence perhaps did not strictly fall within the scope of the inquiry of the justices, but they resolved to recommend that *whipping* in terms of the statute before named should be added to the punishment for each of the offences. The present maximum punishment for the misdemeanors is penal servitude for five years or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

9. Attempt to have carnal knowledge of a girl under 12.

This is an indictable misdemeanor triable at the sessions, the present maximum punishment for which is imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. It appeared to the justices to be an anomaly, that penal servitude should be an alternative punishment for the class of cases last before mentioned and not for cases of this nature, they therefore recommend that penal servitude for five years and whipping should be added as alternative punishments for this offence.

The justices then proceeded to consider the questions addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions by the Secretary of State.

1. This question is answered by the foregoing recommendations.
2. To this question the justices resolved to give no answer.
3. The justices recommend that the answer to this question should be "that it is not desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended, except so far as such summary jurisdiction is altered or affected by the foregoing recommendation with regard to aggravated assaults on females and boys."
4. This question is answered by the flogging recommendations.
5. This question the justices recommended should be answered in the affirmative.

PRESTON.

Sir,

Preston Quarter Sessions, Lancashire, Dec. 7, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th October last, addressed to the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions held at Preston, for a part of this county, and for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross I beg to report as follows, and to enclose the various documents referred to.

I received your letter upon the morning of the second day of the Sessions, viz., on Thursday the 22nd October. On the first day of the Sessions, viz., on Wednesday the 21st October, a circular letter from Mr. A. F. O. Liddell, addressed to the clerk of the Petty Sessions, written by the direction of Mr. Secretary Cross, was read and referred to a committee to report thereon to the next intermediate Sessions, and upon the receipt by me of the letter first herein mentioned, that letter was also referred to the same committee to report on to the same intermediate Sessions.

The committee (which was a representative one) met, and after taking both the letters into consideration, unanimously agreed to the report which I beg to enclose.

At the following intermediate Sessions, held on Monday the 23rd November last, the same report was received and adopted, and was by order of Court, also enclosed, directed to be forwarded by the Chairman of the Sessions to the Secretary of State.

I have the honour, therefore, now to enclose the report and order of Court accordingly.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. H. HIGGIN, Q.C.,

Chairman of the Preston Sessions, held at Preston for part
of the county of Lancaster.

Lancashire } At the General Session of the Peace of our Lady the Queen, holden at
to wit. } Preston, in and for the county palatine of Lancaster, on Monday the 23rd
day of November, in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria,
by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen,
Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord 1874, before William Housman
Higgin, Esquire, Q.C., Chairman, and Robert Townley Parker and Charles Roger Jacson,
Esquires, and others their fellows then and there present, Justices of our said Lady the
Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen in the said county, and
also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors in the
said county perpetrated.

The report of the committee appointed to take into consideration the letters from the
Secretary of State upon the amendment of the law relating to the summary jurisdiction
of Justices of the Peace and the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression
of crimes of violence, was received and read.

Resolved, that the report be received and adopted, and that the Chairman be requested
to transmit the same to the Secretary of State.

By the Court,

BIRCHALL, WILSON, & HULTON,
Dep. C. P.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE appointed at the PRESTON QUARTER SESSIONS on the 21st
October last, to take into consideration the letter from the Secretary of State upon
the subject of the amendment of the law relating to the summary jurisdiction of
Justices of the Peace and the measures to be adopted for the more effectual
repression of crimes of violence.

Your Committee have to report to the Court that they met at Preston on the 10th
day of November instant, and took into consideration the matters referred to them.

The Court should be reminded that the Committee was of a representative character,
members having been selected from each of the three hundreds (Amounderness, Black-
burn, and Leyland) forming the Preston Quarter Sessional district.

With a view to answering the inquiries of the Secretary of State, your Committee in
the first place proceeded to consider seriatim the following offences, and whether it was
advisable that any, and if any, what alteration should be made in the punishment for
such offences, viz. :—

1. Common assaults.
2. Aggravated assaults upon females and boys under 14.
3. Indecent assaults and assaults with intent to commit a rape.
4. Unlawfully wounding and inflicting grievous bodily harm.
5. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.
6. Assaults on constables.
7. Assaults with intent to rob.
8. Carnally knowing and abusing girls under 10 and between 10 and 12.
9. Attempts to have carnal knowledge of girls under 12.

1. With regard to common assaults, the Committee did not consider it necessary or
advisable that any alteration should be made in the punishment which can now be
inflicted either summarily or at Quarter Sessions for this class of offences.

2. Aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14.

The Committee resolved to recommend that in cases of this nature the summary
jurisdiction of justices in Petty Sessions should be extended as well to all females as
to all males of whatever age for first offences, but that for subsequent offences all such
offenders should be committed for trial to the Sessions.

3. Indecent assaults and assaults with intent to commit a rape.

These are indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which is at present two
years' imprisonment, with or without hard labour. The Committee recommend that the
word "without" should be omitted, and that the punishment should be increased to five
years' penal servitude or imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding two years.

4. Unlawfully wounding, with or without a weapon or instrument, and inflicting
grievous bodily harm.

These are also indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which at present is
five years' penal servitude, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without
hard labour. The Committee recommend that whipping should be added to the punish-
ment, in accordance with the provisions of Statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

5. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.

These are also indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which is at present the same as for unlawfully wounding, viz., five years' penal servitude, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Committee recommend that whipping should also be added to the punishment in terms of the before-mentioned Statute, and that the word "without" should be omitted.

6. Assaults on constables in the execution of their duty.

These offences are punishable either summarily or by indictment. The maximum punishment which can be inflicted summarily, and which is given by Statute 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112. s. 12. is a penalty of 20*l.*; in default of payment, six months' imprisonment, or imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labour; or in case the offender has been convicted of a similar assault within two years, nine months' imprisonment, with or without hard labour. The maximum punishment which can now be awarded after conviction upon an indictment is imprisonment not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Committee do not recommend any extension of, or alteration in, the summary jurisdiction, but they recommend that penal servitude for five years be added as an alternative punishment after conviction upon an indictment.

7. Assault with intent to rob.

This is an indictable offence, the maximum punishment for which now is five years' penal servitude or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Committee do not recommend any alteration in the punishment for this offence.

8. Carnally knowing and abusing girls under 10, and between 10 and 12.

The first of these offences, viz., "carnally knowing, &c. girls under 10," is a felony, and is only triable at the Assizes. The second, viz., "carnally knowing and abusing girls "between 10 and 12," is a misdemeanor triable at the Sessions. The first offence, perhaps, did not strictly fall within the scope of the inquiry of the Committee, but they resolved to recommend that whipping in terms of the Statute before named should be added to the punishment for each of the offences. The present maximum punishment for the misdemeanor is penal servitude for five years, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

9. Attempt to have carnal knowledge of a girl under 12.

This is an indictable misdemeanor triable at the Sessions, the present maximum punishment for which is imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. It appeared to the Committee to be an anomaly that penal servitude should be an alternative punishment for the class of cases last before mentioned, and not for cases of this nature; they therefore recommend that penal servitude for five years should be added as an alternative punishment for this offence.

The Committee then proceeded to consider the questions addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions by the Secretary of State.

1. This question is answered by the foregoing recommendations.

2. Upon considering this question, the Committee resolved to recommend that in all cases of assault (except common assaults), where the person accused has been convicted before of a similar offence, it should be made compulsory upon justices in Petty Sessions to commit the prisoner for trial either to the Sessions or Assizes.

3. The Committee recommend that the answer to this question should be "that it is not desirable that the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended."

4. This question is answered by the foregoing recommendations.

5. This question the Committee recommend to be answered in the affirmative.

The Committee next proceeded to consider the letter addressed by the Secretary of State to the clerks to the justices of the various Petty Sessional Divisions, asking for any suggestions as to the amendment of the law relating to the summary jurisdiction of justices of the peace, when they agreed to the following resolutions and recommendations, viz. :—

1. That in cases of burglary a discretion should be given to justices to commit such cases for trial either to the Sessions or Assizes.

2. That it is inexpedient to extend the summary jurisdiction of justices of the peace in Petty Sessions, so far as the power of punishment by imprisonment is concerned (except so far as such summary jurisdiction is altered or affected by the foregoing recommendations).

3. That justices in Petty Sessions should have a discretionary power to order juvenile offenders under the age of 14 to be whipped with a birch rod in lieu of any other punishment, and between the ages of 14 and 16 to be whipped with a birch rod in addition to any other punishment to which they are now by law liable.

4. That it is not advisable that the provisions of "The Criminal Justice Act" (18 & 19 Vict. c. 126.) should be extended.
5. That it is inexpedient that justices in Petty Sessions should have summary jurisdiction in cases of larceny by clerks or servants, embezzlement, feloniously receiving stolen property, and obtaining goods or money by false pretences.

(Signed) W. H. HIGGIN,
Chairman.

KESTEVEN.

Sir, Newton House, Folkingham, November 16, 1874.

In reply to the questions in your circular of October 15, regarding crimes of violence, I have the honour to state that I am of opinion that,—

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence and aggravated assaults on women and children is not sufficiently stringent; and I would amend it by giving power to magistrates to send such assaults for trial at assizes, and power to the court to award flogging in addition to other punishment.

2. I would leave it to the discretion of the magistrates, whether to deal summarily with such assaults, or to send them for trial. I say this on account of the uncertainty even in clear cases of obtaining convictions from juries.

3. I would extend the maximum term of imprisonment to be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction to twelve months. Six months is often not too much for assaults which are not of the most atrocious character, and there is nothing left in reserve for those which are.

4. I would certainly authorise flogging as above-mentioned, especially for assaults on women and children.

5. In this county we have had, happily, little or no occasion to test the utility of flogging under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., but as a Visiting Justice I have found the threat of it most efficacious in maintaining the discipline of a prison; and my opinion as to its probable effect in putting down brutal assaults is confirmed by our chief constable, and almost every magistrate with whom I have had conversation on the subject.

I am, &c.

(Signed) W. E. WELBY,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the
parts of Kesteven, Lincolnshire,
held at Sleaford.

SALFORD.

Quarter Sessions for the Hundred of Salford,
Lancashire, December 7, 1874.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th of October last, addressed to the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions held at Salford, for the hundred of Salford in this county, and for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross I beg to report as follows, and to enclose the various documents referred to.

I received your letter upon the morning of the first day of the Sessions, viz., on Monday the 26th of October, when it was read and referred to a committee to report thereon to the next intermediate Sessions.

The Committee, which was composed of one of the most active magistrates from each Petty Sessional division in the hundred, met, and after taking the letter into consideration unanimously agreed to the report which I beg to enclose.

At the following intermediate Sessions held on Tuesday, the 24th of November last, the same report was received and adopted, and was by order of court, also enclosed, directed to be forwarded by the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions to the Secretary of State.

I have the honour, therefore, now to enclose the report and order of court accordingly.

I have, &c.

(Signed) W. H. HIGGIN, Q.C.,
Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the hundred of
Salford, in the county of Lancaster.

Lancashire } At the General Session of the Peace of our Lady the Queen holden at
to wit. } Manchester, in and for the county palatine of Lancaster, on Tuesday the
24th day of November, in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady
Victoria, by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland

Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord 1874, before William Housman Higgin, Esquire, Q.C., chairman, and John Tomlinson Hibbert, and Alfred Aspland, Esquires, and others their fellows then and there present justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen in the said county, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors in the said county perpetrated.

The report of the Committee appointed to take into consideration the letter from the Secretary of State upon the subject of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence was received and read.

Resolved, that the report be received and adopted and that the chairman be requested to transmit the same to the Secretary of State.

By the Court,

BIRCHALL, WILSON, and HULTON,
Dep. C.P.

REPORT of the COMMITTEE appointed at the SALFORD HUNDRED QUARTER SESSIONS on the 26th of October last, to take into consideration the letter from the Secretary of State to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions upon the subject of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

Your Committee have to report to the court that they met at Manchester on the 9th November instant, and took into consideration the subject referred to them.

At this meeting all the members of your Committee (with one exception) were present, and represented five out of the six Petty Sessional Divisions into which the hundred of Salford is divided, viz. :—

The Chairman of Quarter Sessions, and Sir J. I. Mantell, Knt., the Manchester Division.

Alfred Aspland, Esq., the Ashton-under-Lyne Division.

Robert Taylor Heape, Esq., The Middleton Division.

John Tomlinson Hibbert, Esq., the Oldham Division.

The Rev. J. Shepherd Birley, The Bolton Division.

The representative of the Bury Division (Mr. Oliver Ormerod Walker) was not present.

With a view to answering the inquiries of the Secretary of State, your Committee in the first place proceeded to consider seriatim the following offences, and whether it was advisable that any, and, if any, what alteration should be made in the punishment for such offences, viz. :—

1. Common assaults.
2. Aggravated assaults upon females and boys under 14.
3. Indecent assaults and assaults with intent to commit a rape.
4. Unlawfully wounding and inflicting grievous bodily harm.
5. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.
6. Assaults on constables.
7. Assaults with intent to rob.
8. Carnally knowing and abusing girls under 10, and between 10 and 12.
9. Attempts to have carnal knowledge of girls under 12.

1. With regard to common assaults, the Committee did not consider it necessary or advisable that any alteration should be made in the punishment which can now be inflicted either summarily or at Quarter Sessions for this class of offences.

2. Aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14.

The Committee resolved to recommend that in cases of this nature the summary jurisdiction of justices in Petty Sessions should be extended as well to all females as all males of whatever age for first offences, but that for subsequent offences, all such offenders should be committed for trial to the Sessions.

3. Indecent assaults and assaults with intent to commit a rape.

These are indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which is at present two years' imprisonment, with or without hard labour. The Committee recommend that the word "without" should be omitted, and that the punishment should be increased to five years' penal servitude, or imprisonment with hard labour not exceeding two years.

4. Unlawfully wounding with or without a weapon or instrument, and inflicting grievous bodily harm.

These are also indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which at present is five years' penal servitude, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without

hard labour. The Committee recommend that whipping should be added to the punishment in accordance with the provisions of statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

5. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.

These are also indictable offences, the maximum punishment for which is at present the same as for unlawfully wounding, viz., five years' penal servitude, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Committee recommend that whipping should also be added to the punishment in terms of the before-mentioned statute.

6. Assaults on constables in the execution of their duty.

These offences are punishable either summarily or by indictment. The maximum punishment which can be inflicted summarily, and which is given by statute 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112. s. 12. is a penalty of 20*l.*, in default of payment six months' imprisonment, or imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labour, or in case the offender has been convicted of a similar assault within two years, nine months' imprisonment, with or without hard labour. The maximum punishment which can now be awarded after conviction upon an indictment is imprisonment not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Committee do not recommend any extension of, or alteration in the summary jurisdiction, but they recommend that penal servitude for five years be added as an alternative punishment after conviction upon an indictment.

7. Assault with intent to rob.

This is an indictable offence, the maximum punishment for which now is five years' penal servitude or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. The Committee do not recommend any alteration in the punishment for this offence.

8. Carnally knowing and abusing girls under 10, and between 10 and 12.

The first of these offences, viz., carnally knowing, &c. girls under 10, is a felony, and is only triable at the Assizes. The second, viz., "carnally knowing and abusing girls between 10 and 12," is a misdemeanor triable at the Sessions. The first offence perhaps did not strictly fall within the scope of the inquiry of the Committee, but they resolved to recommend that whipping in terms of the statute before named should be added to the punishment for each of the offences. The present maximum punishment for the misdemeanor is penal servitude for five years, or imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

9. Attempt to have carnal knowledge of a girl under 12.

This is an indictable misdemeanor triable at the Sessions, the present maximum punishment for which is imprisonment for not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour. It appeared to the Committee to be an anomaly that penal servitude should be an alternative punishment for the class of cases last before mentioned, and not for cases of this nature, they therefore recommend that penal servitude for five years should be added as an alternative punishment for this offence.

Though not immediately within the scope of their inquiry the Committee further resolved to recommend that in cases of burglary a discretion should be given to justices to commit offenders for trial either to the Assizes or Sessions.

The Committee then proceeded to consider the questions addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions by the Secretary of State.

1. This question is answered by the foregoing recommendations.

2. To this question the Committee proposed to give no answer, as there seemed to be a difference of opinion amongst them.

3. The Committee recommend that the answer to this question should be "that it is not desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended."

4. This question is answered by the foregoing recommendations.

5. This question the Committee recommend to be answered in the affirmative.

With regard to the letter from the Secretary of State of the 23rd of September last which was addressed to the clerks to the justices of boroughs and of the various petty sessional divisions asking whether the magistrates would wish to offer any suggestions as to the amendment of the law relating to the summary jurisdiction of justices of the peace, the Committee were of opinion that the consideration of that letter was not legitimately within their powers, inasmuch as it was not addressed to the Court of Quarter Sessions, and had not been referred to them by that court, they nevertheless arrived at a resolution which they requested the Chairman of Quarter Sessions to communicate to the Secretary of State, that they were of opinion that, except so far as the summary jurisdiction of justices in Petty Sessions was affected by the foregoing recommendations, it was inexpedient that such summary jurisdiction should be enlarged so far as the power of punishment by imprisonment is concerned.

(Signed) W. H. HIGGIN,
Chairman.

MANCHESTER.

Sir, January 7, 1874.
I have the honour to forward to you a presentment made by the grand jury of this city at the sessions now being held before me.

I am, &c.

HENRY W. WEST.

The grand jury of the Quarter Sessions (Manchester, 7th January 1875) would be glad if the legislature would confer power upon magistrates both in Petty and Quarter Sessions to punish with more severity cases of violent assaults.

THOS. MORGAN,

Foreman.

MIDDLESEX.

Sir, 64, Queensborough Terrace, Hyde Park, London,
December 2, 1874.

I have the honour to reply as follows to the questions contained in Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson's letter of the 15th ultimo, addressed to me at your request, relative to the adoption of measures for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence:—

1. Subject to the observations offered below in answer to the fourth question, I am of opinion that the existing law is sufficiently stringent. Under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47. and 27 & 28 Vict. c. 47. s. 2., penal servitude for *five years*, or imprisonment for any term not exceeding two years, may be the punishment in cases where the assault has occasioned "*actual bodily harm*," descriptive words sufficient to comprehend all assaults of "*brutal violence*," though the injury sustained may not be of a *permanent* character. The penal law is equally but not more severe in cases of "*unlawful wounding*," either with or without a weapon,—and in all cases where the assault has occasioned "*grievous bodily harm*," though there was no actual "*wounding*." Moreover, courts having cognizance of indictments for these offences may, in addition to the punishments aforesaid, *fine* the offender, and require him to enter into recognizances and find sureties to keep the peace; and the defendant upon conviction on any indictment for *any* assault, may be ordered to pay the prosecutor his *costs* and compensation for his loss of time, or in default to be imprisoned for three months (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 71 & 74). Each of the offences above mentioned is triable at Quarter Sessions; and it is difficult to see how the penal law applicable to them could usefully be rendered more stringent, *in respect of the present kinds of punishment*, especially as in the worst class of cases, where the evidence shows "*malice aforethought*," or deliberate "*intent*," the offender may be indicted for the *felony* under the 18th section of the Act last mentioned, and punished with penal servitude for life. I would add also in reply to this question, that in my opinion it is not desirable, even in cases of aggravated assaults, to deprive the courts of their discretionary power to order the imprisonment to be with, or without, "*hard labour*."

2. I am aware that objections have been raised to the power conferred upon justices in Petty Sessions by the 43rd section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. to punish summarily for aggravated assaults on *females* and *boys under 14 years of age* (for which offences the maximum sentence they may impose is six months' imprisonment with hard labour, or a fine of 20*l.*); but the exercise of this power is properly made *discretionary*, and they are required by the 46th section of this statute to *abstain* from any adjudication, if the assault complained of appears from "*any circumstance*" to be a fit subject for prosecution by *indictment*. It not unfrequently happens in cases of this kind, that both the complainant and the defendant deprecate the sending the charge for trial, and beseech the magistrates to deal summarily with it; and though this should not influence them to adjudicate, if they think the case *should* go to a higher court, yet it shows a general willingness on the part of those most interested to rest satisfied with the judgment of the court of first instance. When charges of assaults are sent for trial, opportunities are afforded for improper compromises, and there is the obvious risk that the offender may thus escape punishment altogether. I do not see that justice would be better promoted by *entirely* depriving stipendiary magistrates or justices in Petty Sessions of the discretionary power they at present possess to punish summarily for offences of this kind; but I think they should refrain from exercising this jurisdiction (and therefore that it should be withdrawn from them) in cases where the defendant has been *previously* convicted of an aggravated assault, punishable under the *above* section, and to *this* extent I think the present law may be advantageously amended.

3. Cases occasionally occur in which it were desirable that these courts should have the power of imposing a heavier fine for the assault than 5*l.*; such cases are no doubt *exceptional*, but I think the present maximum fine for a "common assault" should be increased to 10*l.* But although the maximum *were* thus extended, I do not concur in the suggestion which has been put forward, that stipendiary magistrates and justices in Petty Sessions should have authority to award part of the fine imposed for an assault to the *complainant*, by way of compensation. Such a power would involve a confusion of the functions of a criminal court with those appertaining to civil tribunals. I do *not* think that the maximum term of *imprisonment* which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended; but it seems that according to the present law, the defendant, if summarily convicted of a common assault, cannot be required to enter into recognizances to keep the peace in addition to either of the punishments aforesaid; and I think the law should be amended in this respect, so as to give these courts the same powers for this purpose as are possessed by courts of Quarter Sessions, under the enactment referred to in my answer to the first question.

4. I would preface my answer to this question by declaring my repugnance to the adoption of *flogging* as a punishment for any offence; but the common experience of the criminal courts and of our prisons in every county of the kingdom shows that there is a class of persons among us who habitually commit "assaults of brutal violence" (savage assaults, for example, upon helpless women and children), who are prone to *biting*, *kicking*, and wounding with dangerous weapons, and whom no amount of punishment by way of imprisonment and hard labour, or penal servitude, will deter or restrain from such dastardly offences. As a measure of *personal* justice such men deserve *corporal chastisement*, and would have no right to complain if they were subjected to it; but the principle of the *lex talionis* has been repudiated for ages, and it would be retrograde and barbarous to resort to flogging, if its object and use were simply to inflict retaliative pain and suffering on the offender. Crimes fluctuate, and to check the prevailing tendency, which may be attributable, perhaps, to the temporary influence of example, and to a spirit of emulation in crime which occasionally arises, it becomes necessary at times to punish certain offences with exemplary severity; but it can scarcely be said of those under consideration that their constant occurrence is due to exceptional and transitory causes. I am of opinion that flogging would be efficacious as a *deterrent* from the commission of these crimes of violence, and with a view to their more effectual repression, I think there should be a discretionary power in certain cases to order its infliction. I can see no reason, however, why this punishment should be made applicable only for aggravated assaults on women and children; but I think it should be limited generally to cases in which the assault was not only cruel and brutal in its nature, but caused grievous or actual bodily harm. The pain and scandal of a wife appearing as the prosecutrix of her husband in such a case should be avoided by entrusting the prosecution to some official to be appointed for the purpose. *I think it would be inexpedient to give to courts of summary jurisdiction the power of awarding this punishment even to a very moderate extent.* If flogging were authorised only in respect of assaults of a certain specified character, the indictment, or particular count, under which it were sought to subject the defendant to this additional punishment, should of course follow precisely the words of the statute describing the offence thus punishable; so that the punishment, supposing the court thought proper to order it, would in all such cases have *direct* and *express reference* to the peculiar and aggravated character of the assault which had been proved, and of which the defendant stood convicted. The justice of the punishment, as well as its legality, would thus be beyond dispute, and the grounds for it intelligible to all. There can be no question that the power of ordering this punishment should never be exercised without careful regard to all the circumstances of the case, and in practice it would probably be very sparingly exercised; but the punishment of flogging operates widely and forcibly by way of *example*, and the fact that the courts had been armed with authority to impose this sentence, and would not scruple to use it for the punishment of assaults of exceptional cruelty and brutality, would in my humble opinion render these offences of much less frequent occurrence than they are at present.

5. That it *has* been so, many public writers of repute and other persons competent to form an opinion have confidently asserted, nor have I heard or seen the contrary opinion expressed anywhere; but I am not aware that there is any official information extant which would enable one to answer this question.

I have, &c.
(Signed) P. H. EDLIN.

Sir, Hatfield, Herts, December 18, 1874.

I have the honour to inform you that I laid your circular letter of the 15th October before the Court of Quarter Sessions for Middlesex on the 19th of the same month; that it was referred to the visiting justices of the several prisons and to the Chairmen of the Petty Sessional Divisions of the county; and that their answers to the questions, so soon as they had been received, were laid before the court on the county day of November sessions.

I now beg to enclose for your information a print of the reports of the visiting justices and the Chairmen of Petty Sessional Divisions, and, at the same time, my own answers to your questions.

I have, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions of the
County of Middlesex.

November Adjourned General Session, 1874.

REPORTS of the VISITING JUSTICES and CHAIRMEN of PETTY SESSIONAL DIVISIONS upon the Circular Letter from the Home Secretary with reference to the Punishment of Offences of Violence.

Resolution of the Court.

REPORTS.

N.B.—The numbers refer to the questions in the Home Secretary's letter.

House of Correction, Cold Bath Fields.

1. No; it is not sufficiently stringent; it should be amended by giving to stipendiary magistrates and justices in Petty Sessions greater powers of punishment, and also power to require persons convicted of serious assaults to enter into recognizances, with or without sureties, to keep the peace for a limited time after the expiration of a term of imprisonment.

2. No; it is expedient that justices should have a discretion either to deal with the case immediately or to send it for trial at Assizes or Sessions, according to the particular circumstances. There is a great risk, in cases of assault, when sent for trial, of the matter being compromised and the offender going unpunished.

3. Yes; the maximum fine should be 20*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment should be six months, and that power should be given to justices to award compensation out of any penalty which may be imposed.

4. Yes; the Sessions or Assizes should be empowered to order flogging for savage assaults, although not accompanied by robbery or attempt to rob, especially in case of assaults on women and children.

5. It is believed that it has been efficacious, and it has been found both efficacious and deterrent in punishments for prison offences.

House of Correction, Westminster.

1. No, and that power to flog be given.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Yes; especially in cases of garotting.

House of Detention, Clerkenwell.

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence are not now sufficiently stringent, and a discretionary power to punish such offences by flogging should be given.

2. Aggravated cases of biting or kicking, or cases of aggravated assault on women or children, might be made triable at Assizes or Sessions; but in other respects no alteration should be made in the present summary jurisdiction of justices out of Sessions.

3. The maximum penalty should be 20*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment should be six months, and in all cases of imprisonment hard labour should be compulsory.

4. In cases of biting, kicking, or assault on any person of such an aggravated nature that, in the opinion of the justices before whom the charge is made, the punishment which might be inflicted by law for an ordinary assault is insufficient, as well as in cases of aggravated assaults on women or children, the power of ordering flogging should be conferred, but such power should be confined to Assizes or Sessions.

5. It is believed that flogging has been very efficacious in putting down, not only the offences under the above-recited Act, but other offences in cases where the present law authorises its infliction.

Brentford Division.

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent, and it should be amended by giving to stipendiary magistrates and justices in Petty Sessions greater power of punishment, and also to require persons convicted of serious assaults to enter into recognizances, with or without sureties, to keep the peace for a limited period after the expiration of a term of imprisonment.

2. It is expedient that justices should retain the discretion either to deal with charges of assault summarily or to send them for trial at the Quarter Sessions or Assizes, according to the peculiar circumstances. There is great risk, in cases of assault, when sent for trial, that the matter is compromised and the offender goes unpunished.

3. The maximum fine should be 20*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment six months. Justices should have the power to award a portion of the fine as compensation to the complainant.

4. Flogging should be allowed for savage assaults unaccompanied by robbery. A sentence including flogging should be awarded only by a superior court.

5. The efficacy of flogging in putting down offences is not within the experience of county justices, but it is generally admitted that garotte robberies have diminished since the offenders have been flogged.

Edmonton Division.

1. That it would appear that the penal law existing against assaults of brutal violence is not at the present day sufficiently strong to prevent the increase of this demoralising crime.

2. That generally all cases of a serious character brought before the court at Edmonton, are sent by the bench to be adjudicated upon at the Quarter Sessions.

3. That, arguing from experience, it would seem to be desirable, in all cases of assault which may be summarily disposed of, that both the amount of fine and the period of imprisonment should be extended.

4. The justices think that in exceptional cases of violence, and especially in cases of brutal assault on women and children, flogging should be authorised, as being found to be the most deterrent of any punishment.

5. They can hardly give an answer to this question, as the punishment of flogging is not had recourse to at the Edmonton court; but the justices are persuaded that if the power of administering the birch to juvenile offenders for crimes repeated other than felony, and for a higher age, the result would prove salutary and beneficial.

Finsbury Division.

1. The penal law against assaults of the nature specified in the foregoing question is not sufficiently stringent, and it is desirable that discretionary power should be given to punish such offences by flogging.

2. In aggravated cases of biting or kicking, or of aggravated assaults on women or children, it might be desirable to give jurisdiction to the assizes or sessions only, but in other cases the present summary jurisdiction of justices should be undisturbed.

3. It appears desirable that for an assault the maximum penalty should be increased to 20*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment to six months with hard labour; and it is not desirable that, when an assault should be proved to have been actually committed, the offender should be merely called upon to find bail, instead of being fined or sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour.

4. When a charge of biting, kicking, or any assault of a brutal nature shall be made, especially when the same shall be on women or children, which in the opinion of the justices before whom the charge should be made, is not sufficiently punishable under the law relating to common assaults, power should be given to commit for trial to the sessions or assizes, and the court before which the person is tried should have power, on conviction, to order flogging as part of the sentence.

5. So far as the justices have information, it is believed that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it can now be administered.

Kensington Division.

The queries 5, 4, and 3 should be answered in the affirmative, and 2 and 1 in the negative, and, in addition to the remark on query 3, that the penal law should also be amended by giving a power to order flogging.

St. Margaret's, Westminster, Division.

Our opinion is, that inasmuch as cases such as those alluded to do not come before us, any views we might express on the subject would be simply those of private individuals, and not the result of experience. I submit, therefore, that we are not in a position to reply to the questions contained in the letter addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions.

Spelthorne Division.

1. We do not consider the penal law against brutal assaults sufficiently stringent—at any rate its provisions do not appear, at present, effectual for the purpose of repressing such crimes.

2. We see no reason for diminishing the number of cases of assault which may now be decided summarily.

3. We think it desirable that power should be given to impose heavier fines and longer terms of imprisonment in cases tried by courts with summary jurisdiction.

4. We think that flogging should be administered in all cases of brutal assault, especially, but not only, in cases of assault on women and children.

5. We cannot speak from personal experience as magistrates, but it appears to us that flogging has been efficacious in cases where it has been tried as a punishment.

Strand Division.

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Yes, and especially in cases of garotting.

Tower Division.

As all cases of the kind alluded to are heard at the police courts of the district, the justices acting in the Tower division have not experience to guide them in offering any observations thereon.

Reports have not been received from the Chairmen of the following Petty Sessional Divisions:—

Enfield.

Gore.

Hampstead.

Hanover Square.

Holborn.

Marylebone.

Paddington.

St. James's.

St. Pancras.

South Mims.

Uxbridge.

On the preceding reports the following resolution was passed thereon on the county day of the November adjourned session, 1874.

Resolved—"That the reports now laid before the court be printed and circulated in the usual manner, and that the Chairman be requested to forward copies to the Secretary of State for the Home Department."

ANSWERS to the QUESTIONS addressed to the CHAIRMAN of the MIDDLESEX QUARTER SESSIONS by the Home Secretary, Oct. 15, 1874.

1. No, vide answer 4.

2. The magistrates should be bound to reserve these cases for Assizes or Quarter Sessions, unless it is sworn before them that a miscarriage of justice is from any cause likely to be the consequence of delay.

3. The reformatory effect of imprisonment, unless it can be accompanied by permanent removal to a distance from the scene of the offence, is very doubtful.

4. For all offences of brutal violence flogging is the most suitable penalty. It should

only be inflicted by the authority of the court of Assizes or Quarter Sessions; and liberty should be reserved of inflicting it in instalments. The most effective form of the punishment appears to be that in which the offender, having experienced it once, has to look forward to a repetition of it at the expiration of two or three months.

5. The universal testimony appears to be in the affirmative.

November 20, 1874.

In answer to the queries addressed to him by the circular of October 15, 1874, Mr. Serjeant Cox, Chairman of the Second Court of Middlesex Sessions, has the honour to report as follows:—

Mr. Serjeant Cox's views are based upon the experience of nearly 20 years' extensive practice as counsel in criminal courts, on a service of 15 years as chairman of the Edgware magisterial division, on 16 years' experience as Recorder of Falmouth, and now of Portsmouth, and from having presided as deputy for the assistant judge at Middlesex for 8 years, and having been chairman of the second court for 7 years, during which period he has tried nine-tenths of the indictments for assault and wounding,—more, in fact, than any living judge.

The results of careful consideration of the questions submitted based upon this long and extensive experience may be thus stated:—

1st. The cases are very few in number for which any more stringent law for the punishment of assaults is required. Where there is malicious injury the court may now inflict penal servitude. Cases are occasionally presented in which the violence was so brutal that flogging would be the more appropriate punishment; but such cases are very rare. Although I have tried nine-tenths of all the assaults committed for trial to the Middlesex Sessions during the last seven years, in number not less than 100, there were not in all half-a-dozen which I should have sentenced to flogging had the power to flog been then mine. It may be advantageously renewed for exceptional cases of brutal violence, but it should be inflicted only on the authority of a judge of a superior court at the assizes. I should be most reluctant to give such a power to Quarter Sessions, whether presided over by a lawyer or by a civilian. Certainly it should not be entrusted to magistrates in Petty Sessions. Even where the trial is before a Commissioner at the Central Criminal Court or at the Assizes, this sentence of flogging for an assault should not be passed without the approval of a judge.

2nd. Assaults on the police are so frequent, so brutal, and so dangerous that they should not be permitted to be disposed of by the magistrates, but in all cases sent for trial to the Quarter Sessions. This would make intelligible to the disorderly the fact they do not now recognise, that the law looks upon an assault upon a policeman in the execution of his duty as a very much more grave offence than an ordinary assault. The formalities of a formal trial are more dreaded than the party hearing of a justice room.

3. The maximum fine to be imposed by magistrates may be desirably extended to 10*l*. They should be empowered also to award any portion of the fines as compensation to the injured party, and on payment of the expenses of witnesses. But the period of imprisonment to be awarded to them should not exceed three months. If the case requires more than this it should be sent to the Sessions. The fine and compensation if not paid should be leviable forthwith on the goods of the offender. The court should be empowered also to allow time for payment, or to accept payment by instalments.

4. This is substantially answered above (No. 1). Flogging might be advantageously inflicted for brutal assaults on any persons (without limiting them to women and children). But I repeat as to this the observation in No. 1, as to the entrusting of this power to any but a judge of a superior court, of the supreme court that is to be.

5. Flogging has been undoubtedly efficacious in almost suppressing the crime of robbery with violence. But any exceptional punishment has the effect of repressing the particular crime, at least for a considerable time. There is a fashion in crime. When any form of it is found to prevail, it has been my practice to announce that it will be met with exceptional severity, and to show this by exceptional sentences upon it at the then Sessions. However prevalent before, there is an immediate and certain decrease, and it will almost disappear from the calendar in a few months. In this manner I succeeded in putting a stop to intentional larcenies, at Portsmouth, by soldiers for the purpose of procuring their discharge; to the robberies by railway carriers; to the mischievous offence of stealing lead from the roofs of houses; and to the once popular practice of pot-stealing. The rule I ventured to adopt of invariably awarding double the punishment to the receiver to that inflicted upon the thief has been attended with equally good results.

With this experience, and with the limitations stated, I have no doubt that to mark crimes of brutal violence by an exceptional punishment so dreaded as the lash, would have the effect of restraining many a ruffian from the indulgence of his passion.

EDW. WM. COX.

ENFIELD.

Sir,

January 1, 1875.

I am desired by the justices of the Enfield Petty Sessional Division to forward to you the enclosed answers to your circular of 15th October 1874, and to express their regret that an omission to lay your letter before them has prevented their sending an earlier reply.

I am, &c.

E. LETCHWORTH,
Clerk per J. M.

REPORT of the Justices of the ENFIELD PETTY SESSIONAL DIVISION upon the letter of the Home Secretary dated 15th October 1874.

1. No; we do not consider the present law sufficiently stringent, and we think that additional power of punishment should be given to justices with discretion to bind over to keep the peace as is now given in assaults upon women and children.

2. No; we think it desirable that justices should retain their present discretion to deal with the case summarily or to send it for trial because there is great risk of the witnesses being tampered with, or of the case being compromised, and because it would often be a great hardship to the injured party, and because we find that where (under the Criminal Justices Act, 1855) the option is given to the defendant, he almost without exception elects to have the charge decided before the justices.

3. Yes; we think it desirable that the limit both of fine and imprisonment should be extended, and the justices should have power to award compensation to the injured party, as is now provided in some cases under the Metropolitan Police Acts.

4. Yes; we think that the power of ordering flogging should be given in all cases of aggravated or brutal assaults and especially those on women and children.

5. Yes; we believe that flogging has been efficacious in putting down offences for which it is authorised, and we submit that it would be very desirable to give the justices extended powers of ordering the birch rod to be administered to juvenile delinquents. At present the only option which the justices have in many cases is either to send the offender to prison, or to dismiss the case without any punishment.

JAMES MEYER,
Chairman.

MONMOUTH.

Dingeston Court, near Monmouth,
December 16, 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 15th October last containing five questions respecting punishments for crimes of violence upon which Mr. Secretary Cross desired my opinion, I beg herewith to forward my replies.

I have for simplicity and your convenience placed my answers in the margin of the copy of the questions which was furnished me by the clerk of the peace.

I am, &c.

(Signed) S. N. BOSANQUET,
Chairman, Quarter Sessions, Monmouthshire.

1. Not sufficiently stringent. In general by whipping, viz., in cases mentioned under question 4.

2. Only where whipping is added, as in answer to question 4.

3. No; except, perhaps, three months for two in common assaults, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 42.

4. Yes; in cases under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 17, 18, 20, 28, 29, 30, 37, 41 (whether under or above 16 years). Also assaults on women, and to prevent seamen, &c. working, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 40, 43; but only by Sessions or Assizes; which last two cases magistrates might at their option remit for the purpose to the Sessions.

5. I have no experience, only general information that it is so. From which I believe it to have proved a most effective punishment. Those persons who inflict pain are in general those who fear it most.

I think that flogging would prove to be the best preventive of tyrannical coercion in strikes.

(Signed) S. N. BOSANQUET,
Chairman, Quarter Sessions, Co. Monmouth.

Sir,

16, Queen Anne's Gate, Westminster, S.W., December 23, 1874.

I have the honour to enclose answers to the questions sent by you and forwarded to me by Mr. Bosanquet, the senior Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the county of Monmouth.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE SOMERSET, Q.C.,
Deputy Chairman of Quarter Sessions
for the County of Monmouth.

1. In my opinion convicting for former assaults, however trivial, and dealt with summarily or otherwise, should be inserted in the indictments as previous convictions, and further power of punishment given in case of conviction under such circumstances. A hard and fast rule as to the minimum of punishments would, however, I think, be injudicious, as there is often much aggravation or other extenuating circumstances, and I know of no offence where it is so necessary to give discretion to those entrusted to carry out the law. Cases of stabbing in brawls are frequent in Monmouthshire (I fear on the increase), and the power of sentencing to "whipping" would, I think, be usefully extended to that offence. I tried and convicted a prisoner of stabbing, &c. at the last Quarter Sessions and much regretted that I had not that power.

2 and 3. The powers of justices at Petty Sessions should certainly not be diminished, I should like to see them increased, were I not aware of the strong feeling against increased punishment, except on conviction by a jury. I am satisfied that were it not for the above reason increased powers of punishment would prevent much crime of this description, but after careful consideration I cannot advise it.

4 and 5. In whatever cases flogging can be inflicted at a court of Assize and not at a court of Quarter Sessions, I think the power should be extended to the latter for cases triable at the same. My *personal* experience of the results of flogging is so small that I hesitate to give an opinion, but in my belief it has been successful.

I wish to call attention (though not strictly within the above questions) to riots, &c. taking place during elections. I am strongly of opinion from personal experience that no prisoner charged with riot, &c. taking place in any county or borough between the issuing of the writ and the return of the member being gazetted should be tried except by a judge at the Assizes. It is impossible but that a Chairman of Quarter Sessions should have been interested or be supposed to have been interested in some candidate, and in my opinion justice suffers.

(Signed) GRANVILLE SOMERSET, Q.C.,
Deputy Chairman of Quarter Sessions for
the County of Monmouth.

NORFOLK.

Sir,

Cranmer Hall, Fakenham, Norfolk, October 24, 1874.

I have the honour to inform you in reference to your letter of the 15th October that the letter was submitted by me to the Norfolk Quarter Sessions held at Norwich on 22nd October, when a general opinion was expressed that it was expedient that assaults on women and children should be punishable by flogging in addition to imprisonment or in bad cases penal servitude. That no sentence of flogging for such offences should be passed except at Quarter Sessions or Assizes.

I have, &c.
(Signed) WILLOUGHBY JONES, Bart.
Chairman of the Norfolk Quarter Sessions.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

Dear Sir Henry,

40, South Street, Park Lane, W., November 24, 1874.

I ventured to hand the questions addressed to me by the Home Office, and dated Whitehall, October 15, to Mr. Burdon Sanderson, who has for some years taken the second court when there has been one at our Northumberland Quarter Sessions. My own experience as Chairman dates only from about 18 months; so far as it goes it decidedly agrees with Mr. Sanderson's in every particular which he states. And I will do no more therefore than endorse his answers which I enclose.

I am, &c.

(Signed) M. W. RIDLEY,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions
for the County of Northumberland.

ANSWERS to QUERIES put to CHAIRMEN of QUARTER SESSIONS by H. M. Home Secretary's Letter (dated October 15, 1874).

1. I think not.

2. I think every kind of assault in which violence, brutality, or indecency forms a very material element should be absolutely reserved from the jurisdiction of magistrates in Petty Sessions, and should be dealt with exclusively at Assizes or Quarter Sessions. I think, further, that this element, where it does not already do so, should come before a jury in the form of a special count in the indictment.

3. I think not. Indeed, I should prefer to see the period of imprisonment on summary conviction, which is extended in some classes of assault to six months, limited to three months. Besides that, an amount of punishment inflicted summarily is much less deterrent than the same on indictment. There is, in my experience, a very great disposition not to send for trial cases that ought to go there when magistrates acting summarily hold such heavy sentences in their discretion.

4. In the cases referred to, and especially in assaults on very young children for indecent purposes, and where the knife is used (a practice increasing in frequency), I think flogging should be in the discretion of the presiding judge. I can conceive of nothing more likely to lead to disastrous results than to intrust such a power to courts of summary jurisdiction, especially to borough benches. The infliction of flogging as criminally administered is an irreparable injury to the person suffering it; should not, in my opinion, be inflicted without the greatest consideration by those trained to exercise it judicially, and after trial by jury.

5. I have no great experience on this matter, but I believe it to be the strong opinion of both borough and county police here that it has been so efficacious.

(Signed) R. BURDON SANDERSON, J.P.,
Northumberland and Newcastle-upon-Tyne,
and Acting Chairman in several united
Quarter Sessions, Northumberland.

1874.

NOTTINGHAM.

Sir,

East Retford, December 10, 1874.

Mr. Secretary Cross's circular of the 15th ult. does not express whether the answers requested to be given to the questions therein put are to be based upon the experience of those engaged in the administration of justice derived from the cases brought before them within their own particular jurisdiction, or whether such answers are to be given generally.

If the former, I would observe that the Retford Petty Sessional district is made up of parishes (65 in number) purely agricultural, and that the Newark and Worksop Petty Sessional districts, which are combined with the Retford Petty Sessional district for Quarter Sessions jurisdiction, are similarly constituted, that crime is, perhaps, at its minimum in those districts, and that the existing penal laws have hitherto been sufficient.

But whether this state of things will continue, having regard to the crimes now of such frequent occurrence in other districts and counties, is another matter.

If the answers are to be given generally, then I would state them thus :—

1. No ; as to amendment, see answer to question 4.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. I believe so.

I am, &c.
(Signed)

WILLM. BRIDGEMAN-SIMPSON,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the East
Retford division of the county of Not-
tingham, and one of the acting Justices
for the East Retford Petty Sessional
division of the same county.

Sir,

Newark, January 16, 1875.

I have the honour to enclose copies of replies from the visiting justices of the House of Correction, and from the Nottingham, Newark, Bingham, and Mansfield petty sessional divisions of the county of Nottingham, to the five questions contained in Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson's circular of the 15th October last, addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, in reference to the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

I am, &c.

P. F. A. BURNABY,
Clerk of the Peace.

Copy.

Dear Sir,

House of Correction, Southwell, Notts, January 1, 1875.

Your letter dated the 9th November last, addressed to the Governor of the House of Correction, together with a copy of a letter from the Home Office, asking to be acquainted with the views of those engaged in the administration of justice, with reference to five questions contained therein, have been laid before me, and in reply I beg to state,—

1. That the present state of law does not appear to me to be adequate in repressing crime in such cases as those of aggravated assaults on women and children, indecent assaults, and assaults attended with brutal violence. In my opinion it requires amendment, and ought to be extended.

2. That all assaults of an aggravated character should be made triable only at assizes or quarter sessions.

3. That both the maximum fine and maximum imprisonment in cases of common assaults by summary jurisdiction ought to be extended.

4. That flogging ought to be authorized for all offences of brutal violence, indecent assaults, and assaults on women and children.

5. There have been no punishments by flogging at the House of Correction under the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. Of this I am unable to offer an opinion, but I certainly believe such punishments to be both salutary and deterrent.

I am, &c.

J. H. BECHER,
Visiting Justice.

At a meeting of the magistrates held at the Shire Hall, Nottingham, on Saturday, November 28, the following answers unanimously agreed to be made to the inquiries of Mr. Secretary Cross.

1. The magistrates so far as this district is concerned, see no special reason for extending their powers beyond those already possessed at petty sessions, and in cases of sufficient violence to justify a committal to quarter sessions the magistrates think the punishment now authorised of two years imprisonment, together with hard labour added, would be sufficient.

2. The magistrates are now vested with discretionary power to commit to the assizes or sessions any case of assault of apparently sufficient violence to justify such a course, and they see no sufficient reason for alteration.

3. Answer in No. 1.

4. The magistrates would regret to see vested in petty sessions any extension of the power to flog, now confined to juvenile offenders, but the magistrates think such a power might be well vested in assizes and quarter sessions in cases of brutal violence on old men, women, and children.

5. The magistrates have no experience so far as this district is concerned, but believe from public reports it has been efficacious in other parts of the country.

At a meeting of the magistrates held at the petty sessions room, Bingham, on Thursday, December 3, the following answers unanimously agreed to be made to the following inquiries of Mr. Secretary Cross.

(The answers given by the Bingham bench agree in every particular with those made by the Nottingham bench.)

Dear Sir,

Newark, December 9, 1874.

In reply to Mr. Secretary Cross's letter of October 15 last, with reference to the punishment inflicted in cases of brutal violence, addressed to the chairman of quarter sessions for Nottinghamshire, I am requested by the magistrates acting for the Newark petty sessional division to forward you the following replies:—

1. In this agricultural district, assaults of brutal violence or indecent assaults on women and children seldom occur, and we think the penal law sufficiently stringent.

2. We are not aware that any assaults now summarily punishable should be declared triable only at courts of assize and quarter sessions.

3. We think that a certain class of cases, namely,—assaults upon women and children, brutal assaults upon men, and upon police constables, might be advantageously punished either by flogging, or six months imprisonment, or a fine of 25*l*.

4. We think that flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those named in 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., and especially in cases of assault on women and children.

5. We believe that flogging has been found very efficacious when that punishment is by law permitted.

I am, &c.

J. HANDLEY,

Chairman of the Newark petty sessional division
of the county of Nottingham.

Magistrates Clerk's Office, R. J. Parsons, Solicitor, Clerk,
Mansfield, December 4, 1874.

Dear Sir,

I have laid the copy letter from the Secretary of State, dated the 15th October last, before the magistrates of this division, and am directed by them in reply to state that the only alteration which appears to them to be desirable, as far as it concerns this petty sessional division, is to make section 43 of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., relating to aggravated assaults, applicable to men as well as to women and children.

Yours, &c.

R. J. PARSONS.

OXFORD.

Sir,

Pyrtton Manor, Tettsworth, Oxfordshire, November 25, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 15, 1874, addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions of Oxfordshire, containing Mr. Cross's request to be informed of my opinion on certain points contained in the letter, and I beg to reply that—

1. I am of opinion that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is not sufficiently stringent, and may be amended by giving power to the courts to add whipping to the punishment to which persons are already liable who may be convicted under the provisions of sections 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, or 29 of the Offences against the Person Act, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and also to offences under the 43rd section of the same Act, in cases where the offender shall, under the 46th section of the Act, be committed for trial on indictment.

2. I know of none such.

3. No.

4. Answer to No. 1 applies to this.

5. There is no experience in this county.

I may add that, having shown these replies to the Vice-chairman of Quarter Sessions, he acquiesces in them.

In deference to your letter I also convened the magistrates of the county, and I beg leave to enclose a copy of the minutes of the meeting.

I have, &c.

(Signed) HUGH HAMERSLEY,
Chairman, Quarter Sessions, Oxfordshire.

At a meeting of the magistrates of the county of Oxford at the County Hall, on Saturday the 21st of November 1874,—convened by Mr. Hamersley (the Chairman of Quarter Sessions) for the purpose of a conference previously to his replying to the important letter addressed to him by the Secretary of State as to “the measures to be adopted for “the more effectual repression of the crimes of violence now unhappily so common “among certain classes of the population,”—

PRESENT :

Hugh Hamersley, Esquire, Chairman,
The Right Honourable J. W. Henley,
M.P.,
Charles Lane, Esquire,
Robert Bullock Marsham, Esquire,
D.C.L.,
Henry Norris, Esquire,
John Henry Ashhurst, Esquire,
The Reverend Edward Fanshawe Glanville,
John Weyland, Esquire,
Henry Barnett, Esquire,
William Barrington Reade, Esquire,

The Reverend Daniel Ward Goddard,
George Rochfort Clarke, Esquire,
Alexander Clark Forbes, Esquire,
Holford Cotton Risley, Esquire,
Charles Edward Thornhill, Esquire,
Edward Slater Harrison, Esquire,
William Earle Biscoe, Esquire,
The Reverend the Master of Pembroke College,
Lieutenant Colonel James Miller,
Timothy Edward Cobb, Esquire,
William Henry Ashhurst, Esquire; and
John Francis Penyston, Esquire;—

Mr. Hamersley introduced the subject by reviewing the statutory provisions immediately applicable to it, and then suggested to the meeting that whilst he was anxious to ascertain, for the information of the Secretary of State, the opinion of the magistrates at large, he should feel it to be his duty,—concurrently with any expression of the opinion of the meeting,—to convey his own views in a separate letter to the Home Office.

Mr. Henley then addressed himself to the first question in the Secretary of State's letter whether “the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling “assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, is sufficiently stringent, “and, if not, in what way should it be amended?” And Mr. Henley showed by statistics that during the last ten years in Oxfordshire (inclusive of the towns) there has been a large decrease in the number and the character of assaults;—aggravated assaults upon women and children, for instance, having decreased in the ten years ending 1873 from 130 to 103; and there being a further decrease in 1874: that assaults on police officers and common assaults have severally decreased: And that the cases remitted by Petty Sessions for trial by a jury decreased from 58 in the first half of the ten years to 28 in the second half. Also that it is observable that not a single case of garrotting has been known in Oxfordshire.

Further, that, passing from the county of Oxford to the whole of England and Wales there has been a decrease from 14,652 aggravated assaults decided summarily in the first half of the ten years, to 13,391 in the second half; and, as to cases sent to Quarter Sessions and Assizes, a decrease from 6,427 to 5,178;—so that no alteration in the law would appear to be called for unless demanded by the statistics of 1874,—of which at present the magistrates have no information.

And, contending that the opinion of the magistrates should be limited to the area of the county, the facts as to which are within their knowledge,—and should not be extended to the kingdom generally, as to which they have not the necessary data,—Mr. Henley moved, and Mr. Lane seconded the following motion:

That inasmuch as there is not an increase, but a decrease in the county of Oxford of assaults accompanied by brutal violence, no alteration of the existing law is requisite: And that, with reference to this class of offences in the county at large, the magistrates have no evidence or data upon which to form an opinion.

Upon the chairman submitting this resolution to the meeting, nine voted for, and three against it.

As to question 2,—Resolved that, in the opinion of the meeting there are not any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at Assizes and Quarter Sessions.

As to question 3,—That it is not desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

As to question 4,—That an answer to it is conveyed by the resolution passed with reference to question 1.

As to question 5,—That as there has been no experience in this county of the offences described in section 1 of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. the meeting forbear to offer an opinion upon the efficacy of the punishment described.

In the course of the discussions, Mr. Lane expressed his belief that the police and other magistrates occasionally fail to exercise sufficiently in cases of brutal assaults the authority given to them: And that the remedy lies with the magistrates themselves to exercise the punitive power with which the law has invested them. And Mr. Glanville expressed his concurrence in this.

Mr. Rochford Clarke expressed an opinion that the punishments for assaults which the magistrates in Petty Sessions are already enabled to inflict should not be extended to flogging adults; but that it is desirable to add flogging (as enacted by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. s. 1.) for the indictable offences mentioned in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 18 & 20,—introducing, where requisite in the statutes, “with intent,” before the words as to “grievous bodily harm”;—Mr. Thornhill observing that legal proof of “grievous bodily harm” often fails to be adduced.

Mr. Hamersley, in again alluding to the Acts of Parliament, expressed a strong objection to empowering magistrates in Petty Sessions to order offenders to be flogged with a cat.

Mr. Barnett thought it important that these several expressions of opinion should be communicated to the Secretary of State in addition to the formal resolution passed at Mr. Henley’s instance.

And Dr. Marsham, Mr. Forbes, and Mr. Harrison, having respectively addressed the meeting on the various points,—it was agreed that it should be expressly intimated to the Secretary of State, with reference to the above resolution, that the meeting declined to enter upon the abstract question of general criminal law imported into the letter under discussion.

JOHN M. DAVENPORT

Clerk of the Peace.

SHROPSHIRE.

Sir,

Pradoc, West Felton, R.S.O., October 23, 1874.

I have this morning received your letter, dated October 15, conveying Mr. Secretary Cross’s desire for my observations and opinion on several questions relating to crimes of violence.

They shall have my best consideration and my answers as soon as I can satisfactorily give them.

Yours, &c.

(Signed) J. K. KENYON,

Chairman of the Shropshire Quarter Sessions.

SOMERSET.

1. Extend to “all” cases of aggravated assaults the power of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43.

2. No.

3. Answered in No. 1.

4. Yes, by order of Quarter Sessions.

5. It would seem so.

(Signed) R. H. PAGET,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions, county of Somerset.

Sir,

Wells, Somersetshire, October 2, 1874.

In reference to the five several questions proposed by the Home Secretary in the circular of October 15, 1874, with a view to the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, I am of opinion as follows :—

1 & 2. That in cases of assaults on women and children flogging may be with advantage authorised by law in addition to, but not in substitution of, the present punishment of imprisonment with hard labour.

2 & 3. That the summary jurisdiction, as at present existing, over assaults, does not stand in need of any restriction, but that it would be very desirable, in cases of *assaults upon males*, that justices in Petty Sessions should have power to inflict a similar punishment and a similar penalty to that which they are at present empowered (by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43.) to award in cases of assaults on females, and on boys not exceeding 14 years of age, viz., *not exceeding six months' hard labour or a sum of 20l.* In other words, I would read that section as if, after the words "battery upon any male," the qualifying words immediately following, viz., "child whose age shall not in the opinion of such justices exceed 14 years," were struck out.

The age and sex of the party assaulted would thus be left, and, in my opinion, properly left, as an important element which the justices would naturally take into their consideration in estimating the quality of the offence, as an assault of a more or less aggravated character. And the effect of the alteration would be that the summary jurisdiction would be extended to all those cases of assault (irrespective of age or sex) to which, in the opinion of the justices, an imprisonment for six months with hard labour or a penalty of 20l. would be an adequate measure of punishment, with the addition, in cases of assaults on women or children, of the infliction of flogging, in consideration of the more cowardly and degrading nature of the offence.

At present, the summary jurisdiction in cases of assaults upon males over 14 years is regulated by the preceding section (viz., section 42.) of the Act 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and the punishment is limited to two months' hard labour, or a fine of 5l. to include costs; and it is of constant occurrence at Petty Sessions that cases in which the evidence is clear and the offence admitted or not denied are transmitted to Assizes and Quarter Sessions, solely because in the opinion of the justices the punishment which it is now in their power to award would not adequately meet the justice of the case.

5. I am unable to speak from personal experience, and the offences referred to in 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. are of comparatively rare occurrence in this county and neighbourhood.

I am, &c.

(Signed) THOS. E. ROGERS,
Recorder of Wells and Deputy Chairman
of Somerset Quarter Sessions.

STAFFORD.

Sir,

Betley Court, Crewe, October 26, 1874.

I respectfully submit the following observations on the questions put to me in your letter of the 15th instant.

1. I think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence and indecent assaults is now sufficiently stringent, but that in consequence of a desire to have cases summarily disposed of the remedy by indictment is not resorted to so often as it might be.

2. In cases of assault a prosecutor very rarely exercises his right of going before the grand jury in the first instance, and in this county the justices send very few cases for trial at the Assizes and Sessions. When cases are sent for trial there is a great disinclination on the part of the juries to convict upon the counts of the indictment charging the graver offence, and when they do convict, in most cases they return a verdict of guilty of "a common assault." On the whole, I doubt the expediency of taking away the discretion of the justices to punish summarily. The fact of a summary punishment following quickly upon the commission of the offence is not without its effect.

3. Considering the high rate of wages, and the description of persons who are sometimes summoned for assaults, I think that the maximum fine and maximum term of imprisonment which may now be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction might safely be doubled, the fine should be clear and independent of the costs (not as now, including the costs), and power might be given to the convicting justices to award compensation out of the fine to the complainant.

4. If flogging were authorised in cases of assaults, I think it should necessitate a commitment to the county prison for a short term as part of the sentence, in order that the flogging might be uniformly and fairly administered. If the power of flogging were given to two justices sitting in Petty Sessions, great inequality of punishment might exist. It might be that on some occasions the two justices may have been but a short time in the commission of the peace, and not have had much experience in the administration of criminal justice, and the apportionment of punishments; and unless a term of imprisonment was also imperative, the flogging would be entrusted to an officer of police, the instruments would vary, and no surgeon being present, great injustice, or even cruelty, might be inflicted. In the case of an indictment the juries, knowing that flogging might possibly follow their verdict, would, I think, be still less inclined to convict for the higher offence. For these reasons I think that flogging should not be further authorised for assaults.

5. In this county the offences to which the punishment authorised by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. are not of frequent occurrence, and I doubt whether the provisions of that Statute have had any effect, either one or the other, in the county.

I may add that so far as my experience goes, 25 years of regular and constant attendance at a large Petty Session in the north of the county, and at Quarter Sessions, a very large proportion of the assaults which, accompanied with more or less violence, disposed of both summarily and at Quarter Sessions, are the result of drunkenness, occasionally of jealousy or other family quarrels, and but rarely premeditated.

I am, &c.

(Signed) THO. L. TWEMLOW,
Chairman of the Quarter Sessions for the
county of Stafford.

WEST SUFFOLK.

Sir,

October 30, 1874.

In reply to the inquiries which Mr. Secretary Cross did me the honour to forward for the purpose of ascertaining my views as to the existing state of the law with respect to crimes of personal violence, I beg to subject the following answers:—

1. I think that in the great majority of cases the provisions of 24 & 25 Vict. are amply sufficient, if the law be administered with vigour, at the same time there are many cases of brutal assaults which do not come within section 11, but call for as severe punishment as offences under that section.

2. I think it would be right to repeal section 43, and enact that *all* aggravated assaults should be triable only at Assizes or Quarter Sessions. The moral effect of a summary conviction is far less, both as regards the offender and the public, than the verdict of a jury, and therefore it seems to me especially desirable in offences against the person to give publicity to the trial. I would define an aggravated assault to be one attended with serious injury to the body or health of the person assaulted.

3. I do not think that any extension of the term of imprisonment or increase of time would be of any service.

4 and 5. The effect of the Act which authorised flogging as a punishment seems to be admitted on all sides to have been most efficacious, and I cannot doubt but that if the cowardly ruffians who have no regard for sex or age knew that their violence would subject them to corporal punishment, such offences might be diminished.

I have, &c.

BEN. B. HUTER-RODWELL,
Chairman, West Suffolk Quarter Sessions.

SURREY.

Sir,

East Sheen, Surrey, November 13, 1874.

In reply to your communication of the 15th October, asking for my opinion with regard to the adoption of certain measures for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, I beg to inform you that your letter reached me a day too late to lay it before the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions.

I have, however, since had the opportunity of consulting with the most experienced magistrates in the county, and finding that their opinions entirely coincide with my own,

I think it best to reply at once to your questions rather than wait to lay them before the court at the Epiphany Sessions.

I should premise that in my replies I confine myself to these cases which are within the jurisdiction of county magistrates, and purposely give no opinion with regard to offences cognizable only by the higher tribunals.

1. Violent assaults as tried by courts of Quarter Sessions come generally under one of the three following heads :—

1st. Common assaults.

2nd. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm.

3rd. Malicious infliction of grievous bodily harm.

The maximum punishments of one year's imprisonment and of five years' penal servitude respectively under section 47 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., seem adequately to meet the two first classes of offences; but the punishment of five years' penal servitude under the 20th section is frequently found a very insufficient punishment for the third mentioned crime.

If the maximum penalty in this case were extended to 10 or 14 years, with the power also of sentencing to flogging, it might do much towards doing away the not undeserved reproach that offences against the person are treated with undue leniency as compared with offences against property.

2. It would be difficult to define classes of assaults which should be removed from the jurisdiction of police magistrates and Petty Sessional courts, as so much depends on the particular features of each individual case. Probably the present law is the best, which without classification allows the summary disposal of slight offences, whilst those of a more aggravated character are committed for trial.

3. The terms of imprisonment might perhaps with advantage be extended from two months to three; though the graver offences are best dealt with by a jury.

4. There are few reforms of the criminal law more needed than the authorisation of flogging for those assaults in which grievous bodily harm is maliciously inflicted.

Though not strictly relevant to the question, I may perhaps be allowed to add that in judgment the same power should be given in all cases of

Indecent assaults on women and children;

Indecent exposure of the person; and,

Publication of indecent prints and books.

But in no instance should courts of summary jurisdiction be empowered to sentence adults to this punishment.

5. Recourse should be had to the statistics at the Home Office, and the opinion of Her Majesty's judges for a reply to this question, as courts of Quarter Session have no jurisdiction in the case referred to.

I may, however, be permitted to state that my experience as a visiting justice of our prisons convinces me that there is no punishment so much dreaded by the criminal classes or so likely to act as a deterrent.

I remain, &c.

(Signed) E. H. LEYCESTER PENRHYN,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions for
the county of Surrey.

WEST SUSSEX.

Sir,

Fair Oak, Petersfield, January 23, 1875.

I have the honour to enclose on the other side my answers to the questions contained in Mr. Cross's circular of the 15th October, which were only delivered to me at the Epiphany Sessions by the clerk of the peace.

I have, &c.

J. J. CARNEGIE,
Chairman, West Sussex Session.

Answers.

1. I think that in cases of brutal assault the punishment might well be increased.
2. I see no objection to increasing the power of justices, provided that they are not intrusted with the power of ordering corporal punishment.
3. I think it may be extended within moderate limits.
4. In cases only of violent and brutal assaults on women and children.
5. I think it has proved a useful deterrent.

J. J. CARNEGIE.

WESTMORELAND.

Sir, Eversley, Milnthorpe, October 28, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th October, requesting the opinions of the justices as to cases of assault. The letter not having arrived till after the conclusion of the Sessions week, it will necessarily take some time to collect the opinions of the different Petty Sessions, but I will do so as soon as possible.

I am, &c.

F. A. ARGLES,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Westmoreland.

Sir, Eversley, Milnthorpe, December 2, 1874.

In reply to your letter of the 15th October last, requesting answers from me, as Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Westmoreland, to certain queries relative to crimes of violence, I beg to submit the following answers for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross as my own opinion and that of all the other magistrates of this county whom I have been able to consult, premising, however, that our county being small and very free in general from these crimes, we have not much personal experience to guide us.

1. No, except as per answer to No. 4.
2. No.
3. In aggravated assaults against men we think the amount of fine or imprisonment might safely be doubled.
4. We think that flogging might be advantageously used in other cases of brutal violence, especially in cases of assault on women and children.
5. Yes.

I have, &c.

FRANK A. ARGLES,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions,
Westmoreland.

YORKSHIRE.

NORTH RIDING.

Sir, Horsley, Eastgate-by-Darlington, November 5, 1874.

Before replying to the questions upon which the Secretary of State has done me the honour to invite the expression of my opinion, I desire to make some general observations as to assaults of brutal violence, and as to the application of flogging as a punishment for repressing such offences, especially in cases of assaults on women and children.

The punishment of flogging has been applied chiefly to two offences, viz., to attacks on Her Majesty the Queen and to garotters, and in each case, no doubt, the punishment has been effectual in repressing altogether, or in deterring, the commission of the offences.

But these cases are, I think, to be distinguished from those assaults of brutal violence to which the questions propounded point.

In the one class, the offence is conceived with premeditation, and is carried out with deliberate calculation, and under no such influence as is observable in assaults of brutal violence, reflection is present to the mind, the punishment is taken into the calculation, and it deters.

But in the class of assaults upon wives and children, the offence is seldom premeditated, and in almost all other cases it is committed by persons of brutal passions when inflamed and excited by drink, and by habits of drinking. At such moments, when reason and reflection are blinded, and all feelings but those of the brute are blunted, it is unlikely that the punishment of flogging, if imposed, would be present to the mind, or, if present, would have a deterring effect. And, therefore, I doubt much whether such a punishment would repress the offence, or have any other effect than that of brutalising, when sober, the feelings of a man who had proved himself a brute when drunk. The direct cause of his violence is drink; in abstinence from it is, I think, to be found the true remedy for the offence. And so far as that abstinence is secured, or

the habit broken, by a long term of imprisonment, I think there is ground for expecting the repression of the offence from that mode of punishment rather than from flogging.

In brutal assaults upon wives, the better feeling often returns in sober moments; the attachment of the wife is not extinguished, and though compelled, for her own security, to give evidence against a brutal husband, whose conduct is to be punished by imprisonment, there would be a greater reluctance (and consequently a less certainty of conviction) if the wife were to give evidence which would subject her husband to flogging. The certainty of punishment is, I think, an element in repressing all offences.

Again, if flogging were imposed and found not to be successful in repressing these offences, or attended with other disadvantages, its application would probably be repealed, and there might be a danger or a necessity of repealing also its application to those offences to which already its application has been found to be successful. From these considerations, I think flogging should not be authorised in cases of assaults on women and children, nor do I think it should be extended to other cases than those within the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence should, I think, be made more stringent. The maximum punishment for unlawfully or maliciously wounding, at present five years' penal servitude, should be increased to 10 years, and as, upon an indictment for this offence, a verdict of common assault is frequently returned most improperly, the punishment for common assault should be increased to two years' imprisonment with hard labour.

2. If the maximum term of imprisonment imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction for common assaults should be increased, as I think it may, to six months with hard labour, there may yet be some assaults of so grave a nature as to require a more severe sentence. These might, with propriety, be sent to the Quarter Sessions; *the defendants not being admitted to bail*.

3. I think the maximum fine may be extended to 10*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment to six months, and in addition, in both cases, the defendant to enter into recognizances, with sureties, to keep the peace. This cannot, at present, be done.

4. I think not.

5. So far as I have had an opportunity of judging, I think it has been efficacious.

I am, &c.

(Signed) JOHN R. W. HILDYARD,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions,
North Riding of Yorkshire.

EAST RIDING.

Sir,

Beverley, October 26, 1874.

In reply to a communication received from Her Majesty's Secretary of State dated the 16th inst., I beg to reply as follows:—

1. I think the existing penal law against assaults accompanied by brutal violence, such as kicking, is not sufficiently stringent, and I am of opinion that flogging would be effective in reducing the frequency of such offences.

2. I do not consider that any kind of assaults which may now be summarily disposed of would be more advantageously tried by indictment at Quarter Sessions, but I think that in the event of flogging being authorised as a punishment, the cases to which it may be made applicable should be triable at Assizes and Quarter Sessions only.

3. I offer no opinion.

4. I think that the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. as regards flogging may be applied with great advantage to cases of aggravated assaults on women and children, and also to other violent assaults of a ferocious and brutal character.

5. I am persuaded that flogging has been signally efficacious in stopping garrotte robberies.

I am, &c.

(Signed) ROBERT WYLIE,
Acting Chairman of Quarter Sessions,
East Riding of Yorkshire.

ANGLESEY.

Sir, Beaumaris, November 22nd, 1874.
 Referring to your circular letter of the 15th ultimo addressed to the Chairman of Quarter Sessions of this county, I am directed to inform you that the experience of the justices of this county is so limited in the class of cases mentioned therein that they cannot venture to offer an opinion on the questions therein asked.
 I have, &c.
 (Signed) RICHARD OWEN, C. P.

BRECON.

Sir, Penpont, November 5, 1874.
 That assaults attended with brutality and violence have of late been greatly on the increase no one can deny, and loudly call for means of checking them, but much difficulty in amending the present law will doubtlessly be felt.
 On considering the subject I return replies to the five queries which I have received from the Home Office.
 1. No. I would suggest a modification of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. (which would run something in this way)—“Whosoever shall wound, beat, or strike, or use personal violence to any person of an aggravated nature, **shall be guilty of felony,*” and being convicted thereof, shall be liable at the discretion of the court to be kept in penal servitude for five years, or be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years with hard labour.”
 2. No. I think each case must be left to the discretion of the magistrates.
 3. No. Because the slighter cases only would be dealt with summarily.
 4. The clause for inflicting whipping to apply to aggravated assaults or assaults of an aggravated nature, as in 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.
 5. I cannot say from experience, as no cases where whipping could be applied have occurred in this district. Reports from other districts show its efficiency.

I remain, &c.

PENRY WILLIAMS.

In cases where wives or children are abused, all hard labour earnings to be given to family.

DENBIGH.

1. I think the court should have a discretionary power to add flogging.
2. I do not think so.
3. Not in my opinion certainly.
4. I think it would be very desirable.
5. I have no experience of this.

(Signed) THOS. HUGHES,
 Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Denbighshire.

* These words may or may not be omitted.

GLAMORGAN.

Sir,

Clerk of Peace's Office, Cardiff, November 2, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge your circular respecting the more effectual repression of crimes of violence addressed to me as Chairman of Quarter Sessions of the county of Glamorgan. I have already answered the same circular in my capacity of stipendiary magistrate of the borough of Cardiff, and I have nothing to add to what I have said.

I have, &c.

(Signed) R. O. JONES.

Chairman of Glamorgan Quarter Sessions.

MONTGOMERY.

Sir,

Powis Castle, Welshpool, October 27, 1874.

I have had the honour to receive Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson's circular dated October 15, as to crimes of violence.

I have conferred with the Deputy-Chairman, Sir A. W. Williams Wynn, M.P., who generally presides at the trial of prisoners.

Crimes of violence are so rare in Montgomeryshire that we cannot speak as to questions 1, 3, 4, from our experience within the county.

1. Subject only to the question of adding corporal punishment, we think the power of imprisonment sufficiently stringent.

2. We think it undesirable to prevent the magistrates from exercising summary jurisdiction, or sending a case for trial at Quarter Sessions, according to the circumstances of the case.

3. No.

4. We think that flogging might be authorised as a punishment for assaults on women and children, and for assaults on constables in discharge of their duty, but that such power should only be given after conviction by a jury, and not be exerciseable in Petty Sessions. We further think that the power of flogging a juvenile offender should be extended to the ages of 18 or 19, and that the onus of showing that he is over age should be thrown on the culprit.

5. We have had no cases of this sort in the county.

Yours, &c.

(Signed) POWIS,

Chairman of Montgomery Quarter Sessions.

RADNORSHIRE.

Sir,

Llysclinam, Newbridge-on-Wye, Radnorshire,
Oct. 31, 1874.

I beg to reply as follows to the five queries of Mr. Secretary Cross, respecting the penal law against assaults of brutal violence.

1. The law appears not to be sufficiently stringent. It might be amended by increasing the maximum punishment which magistrates in Petty Sessions or higher courts, respectively, can impose. I will enter into some detail in answering subsequent queries.

2. It is perhaps difficult to define the kinds of assault which ought not to be summarily punished, but which should be triable only at Assizes and Quarter Sessions more accurately than by the existing provision of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 46., which enacts that "in case the justices shall find that the assault is from any circumstance a fit subject for a prosecution by indictment they shall abstain from any adjudication thereupon, and shall deal with the case as if they had no authority finally to hear and determine the same." Not only the degrees of brutality connected with assaults, but also other

circumstances, are so various that a large discretion as to the mode of dealing with each case can hardly be withheld from the justices. Sometimes, even when a case is sufficiently atrocious to be sent for trial, the justices may see good reasons for a prompt decision. They may, for example, find it difficult or impossible to secure the attendance of the prosecutor or an important witness at a future day. This is especially possible where the person assaulted is the wife or female relative of the defendant.

3. I think it is desirable to extend the maximum punishment for assault.

At present it is enacted, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 42., that in ordinary cases of common assault two justices in Petty Sessions may impose a maximum fine of 5*l.*, including costs, or may pass a maximum sentence of imprisonment, with or without hard labour, of two months.

By section 43 of the above Act, where the assault has been committed on a boy not over 14, or on any female, and it is in the opinion of the justices of so aggravated a nature that it cannot be sufficiently punished under the provisions of section 42, the maximum punishment is much increased. The fine, including costs, is extended to 20*l.*, and the imprisonment to six months. Moreover, the justices may require the defendant at the expiration of his punishment to be bound over to keep the peace for six months. I think it would be expedient to remove the limitation as to boys and females, and to extend the jurisdiction of section 43 to all cases of assault, which from aggravation or any other circumstance cannot in the opinion of the justices, be sufficiently punished under section 42. This might be where terror had been added, where two or more persons had taken part, or where brutal threats had accompanied the assault.

I think also that instead of the alternative of fine or imprisonment, power might be given to impose both forms of punishment, and to award the whole or part of the fine, after deducting costs, as compensation to the injured person.

It sometimes happens that the party ordered by the justices to pay the costs is unable to do so. To meet this difficulty I think that power should be given to the justices, as in cases of summary jurisdiction for larceny, to obtain payment of costs on certificate from the justice through the clerk of the peace.

In some cases the payment of costs, even where he has the means, is a great hardship on a prosecutor. He may have suffered injury and have most properly instituted the prosecution, but may have failed to obtain a conviction of the defendant.

4. I think flogging should be authorised in atrocious cases, but only after trial before a judge of Assize, not even by a court of Quarter Sessions.

I think also that the provisions of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47. should be extended, and that in a case of common assault the court should have power to add a fine not exceeding (q. 50*l.*) to the imprisonment and to award the whole or a part to the injured person as compensation.

5. I do not doubt that the punishment of flogging has been highly efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised, but I only speak from reports in the papers, and not from any personal experience.

I remain, &c.

(Signed) R. LISTER VENABLES,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Radnorshire.

From Recorders of Boroughs having Quarter Sessions.

ABINGDON.

Sir,

King's Bench Walk, Temple, December 26, 1874.

In reply to your circular of the 15th of October I beg to state, that in the limited jurisdiction which I administer, as well as in the county of Berks of which I am a magistrate, assaults of brutal violence are almost unknown. The only cases of violent assault with which the justices in sessions have to deal being assaults on policemen in the execution of their duty; in some cases, I am disposed to think, provoked by the indiscretion of the police themselves.

Subject to the above, I will endeavour to reply to your questions.

1. I am of opinion that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent. Assaults of brutal violence ought to be clearly defined, and those who are convicted of them ought, in my opinion, to be subjected to the same punishment as persons convicted of indecent assaults.

2 and 3. There is an advantage in subjecting assaults to summary punishment. In cases where the offenders are sent for trial to the Assizes or Sessions, a considerable time intervenes, the injuries received are for the most part cured, the injured party more disposed to pardon the offence, and the jurors indisposed to convict except for a common assault. At the same time I am indisposed to extend summary jurisdiction particularly in boroughs where, in cases which really require severe punishment, the justices from local associations often want the courage to inflict it. I am decidedly indisposed to intrust such tribunals with the infliction of corporal punishment.

4. I think that in cases of assaults of brutal violence on women and children, flogging, subject to the above remarks, might be properly authorised.

5. My experience does not admit of my returning an answer to this question.

I have, &c.

T. BROS,

Recorder of Abingdon.

BEDFORD.

Sir,

Welwyn, October 30, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of two communications from Mr. Secretary Cross, dated the 15th October 1874, upon the subject of measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

Of these communications (identical in form) one is addressed to me as the recorder of the borough of Bedford, the other as a justice of the peace for the county of Herts.

To the former of these my present answers apply. The latter has been transmitted by me to my brother justices acting with me in the petty sessional division of this part of the county.

As soon as I shall have received their views and opinions I will embody them with my own and transmit them to Whitehall.

In reference to the answers herewith forwarded, I think it right to state that they are not derived from experience, but are based solely upon what I have read in the public prints recording the commission of acts of violence throughout the country.

Fortunately for the peace and comfort of the borough of Bedford it has for so long a time been free from crimes of a very bad quality, *inter alia*, assaults marked with brutal violence, that I, as recorder, have not been called upon to deal with them.

I am, &c.

J. T. ABDY.

ANSWERS to the QUESTIONS proposed by MR. SECRETARY CROSS with reference to measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

1. I should say decidedly that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, a distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is not sufficiently stringent.

There are three ways in which it may be amended :— 1st, heavy fines, coupled with comparatively shorter terms of imprisonment ; 2nd, long terms of imprisonment, coupled with severe labour and hard fare ; and 3rd, infliction of corporal punishment in the shape of flogging, coupled with imprisonment.

2. I do not think that there are any kinds of assaults which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at Quarter Sessions and at Assizes.

3. I think it desirable that the maximum fine which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be increased, in the case of aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14, from 20*l.* with costs to 30*l.* with costs, enlarging the time of imprisonment for default of payment to a term of not more than eight calendar months.

I also think it desirable that in the case of aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14, the maximum term of imprisonment should be extended to 12 calendar months.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for all kinds of assaults accompanied with brutal violence, especially in cases of assaults on women and children. For my own part I should like to see offences of brutal violence towards animals as well as towards human beings punished by the infliction of physical pain.

5. I believe that flogging has been very efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

J. T. ABDY,

Recorder of Bedford.

BERWICK.

Sir,

1, Essex Court, Temple, Oct. 26, 1874.

In answer to the questions forwarded to me under the direction of Mr. Secretary Cross with reference to measures under consideration for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, I beg to say :—

1. I do not consider that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is sufficiently stringent.

2. I think assaults of brutal violence ought to be triable at Assizes or Quarter Sessions only. There may be a difficulty in defining such assaults, but possibly an enactment withdrawing all assaults occasioning serious (or actual) bodily harm from the summary jurisdiction of magistrates might effect the purpose.

3. At the same time I think the hands of the magistrates should be strengthened in the way of the punishment which they have power to inflict summarily in cases of assaults, and that the punishments, both of imprisonment and fine, imposed by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 42 and 43., should be at least respectively doubled.

4. I think that flogging should be authorised for the punishment of other offences of violence besides those mentioned in 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., *i.e.*, robbery with violence and "garotting," and that there should be power to inflict it in all cases of assaults of brutal violence, whether committed upon women and children, or upon adult males. Crimes of extreme violence upon all classes of victims are undoubtedly very rife, perhaps especially in the northern counties of Durham and Lancashire, and I think that they are especially likely to be repressible by corporal punishment ; those who inflict pain fearing and disliking the most, I think, to suffer it themselves. The punishment of "whipping" (whether with "birch" or "cat") appears to me to have been a little misdirected hitherto, or at least insufficiently used, having been applied, except in the cases provided for by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. and 7 & 8 Geo. 4. c. 28. ; only to offenders under 16 years of age, under the Larceny, Offences against the Person, and Malicious Injuries Acts, and having been used therefore more as an instrument to repress mischief than crime. I am fully prepared to advocate using it for the more serious purpose of repressing brutal violence, and in the less merciful shape of repeated "floggings" with the "cat."

5. I believe flogging has been most efficacious for putting down the offences for which it has been used under 26 & 27 Vict. I have a fresh remembrance of the obvious impression produced at the time by the pronouncing by the judges and Queen's counsel, sitting as commissioners upon two successive assizes in the counties of Northumberland and Durham not long ago, of a number of sentences awarding flogging to an unusual

extent, and the kind of robberies of brutal and unreasoning violence, for the punishment of which they were passed, and which were then excessively rife, have since most obviously diminished. After one or two of these sentences had been passed and the untried prisoners in the district began to be alive to their possible fate of being flogged, their anxiety upon the subject, and also the eagerness of crowds of their friends outside, who seemed to be drawn together in unusual numbers, upon the same matter, were most remarkable; and it was quite plain, from the bravado with which the prisoners tried to treat the flogging when it was awarded, and the loud encouragement which they received from their friends to bear it, that it was the part of their sentences upon which the mind of all most dwelt.

I am, &c.

W. T. GREENHOW,
Recorder of Berwick.

BOLTON.

3, King's Bench Walk (North), Temple, London,

Sir,

October 26, 1874.

In reply to the communication addressed to me bearing date 15th October, I respectfully submit the following observations:—

So far as the borough of Bolton is concerned I am strongly of opinion that there is not, and has not been, any such increase of crimes of violence as to call for special legislation or exceptional punishments. I cannot find that either in point of number of cases, or brutality of character, there is any evidence of a "rough terror" existing within that borough. Since I have held the office of Recorder of the borough (*i.e.* since April 1869), four cases of assault have come before me, and of these one, an assault by railway servants within the station, was of a very unusual character. The return which I take the liberty of referring you to, and which I append, has been prepared by the chief constable of the borough. It shows that notwithstanding the increase of population during the last ten years complaints of assault have not increased but rather diminished. Bolton is surrounded by colliery districts, and I cannot doubt that exceptionally high wages among a rough population have been accompanied by some increase of drunkenness and violence, but my jurisdiction is of course limited by the municipal boundary. I desire therefore to confine my observations to the borough alone. Within that area I am convinced that "kicking" and "brutal violence" has not increased, and that the reputation which the press affixes to Bolton is undeserved. I am satisfied that many complainants falsely allege kicking in aggravation of their charge, because of the public sentiment and in hopes of inducing the magistrates to deal with severity with the defendant. These cases appear in the newspapers as "kicking cases," and go to inflame the public mind, while in my judgment the magistrates have been right in dealing with them as cases of trifling and not of serious moment.

So far as my experience extends, therefore I answer your various questions as follows:—

1, 2, and 3. In my opinion the existing law is adequate to deal with crimes of violence. Any cases which in the discretion of the justices are sufficiently serious, ought in my judgment and can now be sent for trial to the Quarter Sessions. I think it undesirable that the powers of courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended. The same discretion which would be necessary in exercising such increased power would be sufficient to enable the magistrates to discriminate between cases which ought or ought not to be sent for trial. I think no longer term of imprisonment than six months should be imposed until after conviction by a jury.

4 and 5. From some experience as counsel in criminal cases, I am abundantly convinced that flogging has been much dreaded as a punishment by the class of criminals in respect of whom it is authorised, and I cannot doubt it has been efficacious as a deterrent. I think therefore that in cases of aggravated violence on women and children, the court of Quarter Sessions might advantageously be authorised, as part of the sentence after conviction to inflict flogging.

I should strongly deprecate giving such power to any court of summary jurisdiction, and I think that the existence of such a power in the court of Quarter Sessions would be an inducement to the justices to send for trial there such cases as in their discretion might warrant such exceptional punishment.

I have, &c.

SAMUEL POPE,
Recorder of Bolton.

RETURN showing the NUMBER of PERSONS proceeded against for ASSAULTS committed in the BOROUGH of BOLTON during TEN YEARS ending September 29, 1874.

Year.	No. of Persons proceeded against.							No. committed to Prison.								Fined.	Bound over to keep the Peace.
	No. proceeded against.			Discharged.		Convicted.		Above 6 Months.	Six Months and above 3.	Three Months and above 2.	Two Months and above 1.	One Month and above 14 days.	Fourteen days and under.	Total imprisoned.			
	Male.	Female.	Persons.	Male.	Female.	Male.	Female.										
1865	386	118	454	229	64	107	54	—	1	4	1	27	11	44	48	69	
1866	348	114	462	206	59	142	55	—	1	8	3	20	14	46	66	85	
1867	368	99	467	212	55	156	44	—	—	9	6	33	24	72	47	81	
1868	355	95	450	206	54	149	41	—	2	9	8	25	24	68	55	67	
1869	406	115	521	236	72	170	43	—	—	9	7	22	26	64	100	49	
1870	353	108	461	210	60	143	48	1	2	8	9	6	14	40	88	63	
1871	317	101	418	172	55	145	46	—	1	8	10	13	20	52	61	78	
1872	334	89	423	193	47	141	42	—	6	5	3	10	20	44	79	59	
1873	322	114	436	193	55	129	59	—	2	16	2	22	22	64	54	70	
1874	321	127	448	189	64	132	63	—	2	5	10	29	18	64	83	48	

THOS. BEECH,
Chief Constable.

BRIGHTON.

Sir, 2, Harcourt Buildings, Temple, November 4, 1874.
I beg to enclose the answers to the questions submitted to me in your circular of the 15th October last.

I am, &c.
JOHN LOCKE.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

1 and 4. I would give power to flog in all cases of assaults accompanied with brutal violence, where the prisoner is tried and convicted by a jury.

2. I would recommend that the power of punishing summarily in cases of such assaults should be abolished, and that all such cases should be declared triable only at Assizes or Quarter Sessions.

3. Having reference to my answer to question No. 2, I think it is not desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonments which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction, should be extended.

5. Even if flogging has not "been efficacious in putting down offences for which" it is authorised as a punishment, it has in my opinion prevented the increase of these offences.

JOHN LOCKE, Q.C.,
Recorder of Brighton.

BURY ST. EDMUNDS.

Sir, 3, Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, October 28, 1874.
In answer to your circular of the 15th instant, I beg to state that crimes of violence have been within my experience extremely rare.

As to question,—

1. I think the present laws sufficient for those parts of the kingdom in which the offence is rare.

2. I do not know that the law is defective in intent, as far as classifying assaults is concerned. Its defect in my judgment is, in not sufficiently providing the means of deciding to which class any particular case under consideration belongs.

This defect, however, in my opinion, exists as to every part of the law, and I refer to a printed paper on the law of homicide, which explains my views as to the proper remedy.

3. I do not think so.

4. I think that flogging is the best punishment for assaults of brutal violence.

I apprehend that where it is now applied, it is applied to the violence and not to the dishonesty. Its further application to cases of violence would therefore be consistent. I think that in dealing with the subject, provocation must not be overlooked. As to this, harmony should be preserved with the law of homicide.

I also think that flogging is the most deterrent of punishments, and therefore the most valuable.

5. I have no means of judging of the effect of this punishment in cases where it has been inflicted.

I approve it, not because I think it does good where it is inflicted, but because of the effort that I believe will be made to avoid its infliction.

I am, &c.

JOHN TOZER,

Serjeant-at-Law,

Recorder of Bury St. Edmunds.

On the DEFINITION and CONSOLIDATION of the LAW of HOMICIDE.—An APPENDIX to
“IDENTITY of METHOD in the SEARCH for TRUTH.” By JOHN TOZER, M.A., LL.D.,
Serjeant at-Law.

The report of a Select Committee on the Bill which had been for some time before the House of Commons, to define, consolidate, and amend the law relating to homicide, has been made since this paper was printed.

The report is adverse, and as the Bill was framed with all necessary care and skill, on a theory which in this paper is denounced as erroneous, it has been thought well to show exactly how the subject would be treated by the opposing method.

The report objects to using the law of homicide for a first attempt at codification, because it is not a proper subject for experiment, as being only known to practising lawyers, and as requiring to be changed before it is condensed or codified.

It may fairly be denied that any change in the nature of an experiment ought to be permitted in any part of the law for the mere purpose of codifying; but the criminal law has for some years been the subject of successive improvements, and what is now required is not experiment, but the mere final step in advance.

The law of homicide would seem to be singularly well adapted to be put in the best possible form, and to serve as a specimen of the best possible method, whatever that method may be. It is short, and the only questions that have been recently raised in it have applied either to the state of the culprit's mind, or to the jurisdiction of the court; questions whose application was therefore not limited to this particular subject. If the whole law, including its examples, be taken together, it will be found to be neither deficient in fixity nor difficult to express with clearness and certainty.

The essential difference between the method of the Bill and that of the paper is this. The Bill assumes that the legislature can, with its own hand, make law complete in all its parts, and adapted to meet all requirements. The paper insists that it is necessary—to observe how law is now, in fact, made—to adopt a process seen to be inevitable, and to seek to render it as perfect as it can now be rendered, and to place it in a position in which every subsequent change must be for the better.

Now observation shows beyond dispute, that the decrees of legislation do not become complete law until by being called into use, judicial interpretation is put upon them. Their language can never be made quite free from ambiguity, nor could it be protected from misconstruction if it were so; its ambiguity is discovered and its misconstruction attempted in actual practice, and it is there that they are met, and the decisions upon them supply materials which must be supplied, before the language of the law can be made complete and certain.

To pass then to the Homicide Bill, 1874, a definition of homicide occupies half its third clause, the other half and the eleven following clauses are used to amplify, limit, and explain this definition.

As to this part of the Bill the report says:—“These terms, such as ‘causing death’ ‘without actual injury to the body,’ ‘causing death by a course of conduct, an act’ ‘by which death is caused, which would not have caused death but for intermediate’ ‘events not its consequences,’ and so forth, would doubtless ultimately have a fixed and technical meaning given to them by judicial interpretation, but in the meantime” “would, it may be apprehended, rather serve to provoke than to remove controversy.”

These terms have long ago received judicial interpretation, and the question now is, whether the general abstract definitions and descriptions of the law can best be made

certain and complete, by appealing to that interpretation at once,—or whether certainty and completeness can be obtained by the use of subsidiary definitions and descriptions, either interposed between the general definitions and descriptions and their interpretations, or substituted for the interpretations?

An example, taken from a much simpler subject, will show how the problem of dealing with descriptions that are ambiguous, or whose language may be perverted, must be worked out.

A geometer who has to draw a curve that cannot be defined knows that if he attempts to do so by merely following the description given, he will neither get exactly the curve that was intended, nor one that will exactly correspond with the curve that another geometer would draw from the same description. He therefore, in conjunction with the designer, fixes a number of points through which the curve must pass; he shifts them and increases their number, until the course of the required curve is marked out with sufficient accuracy.

Now an unscientific person, who merely knew that each of the infinite number of points in a regular curve can be fixed in position by a definition expressed, to the algebraist by three or four symbols, and to the world by a dozen words, may well regard the geometer with his pencil, or the gardener, it may be, with his bundle of sticks, as using a very homely and unartistic method; or may still more fatally think, that to amplify and explain the description, instead of using the points, is the superior method.

In truth, however, the homely method is also the only scientific one; for as the description cannot be elaborated into a definition, it must have some defects, but each point that is marked has its position defined, and if the definitions of the points be tabulated, the table and the description taken together, will differ from a definition only by not including the spaces between one point and another, a difference that can be diminished to any extent by increasing the number of points; and thus the designer will get precisely the curve he wants, and will also get the data for repeating it, either with the same or with other dimensions and proportions; but to do so, he must watch the work as it goes on, and prevent the curve from being thrown out by points that are wrongly placed, because of some want of clearness in his description, or because of a literal compliance with some error that it contains.

By an identical process, accuracy, clearness, and certainty are arrived at in the law; they are first given to individual cases; they can then be, by proper selection and arrangement, imparted to the whole; any amount of abstract defining and describing may follow; but confusion and obscurity will be the result if the supplementary defining and describing precede the marking of the points, instead of following it. Suppose then, that there be taken as a definition:

Homicide is, causing another person to die sooner than he would have died if the act or acts by which his death was caused had not been done, or if any act or acts, which it was the legal duty of the person omitting it or them to do, had not been omitted.

With the enunciation of this, or some such proposition, the work of the legislature, as far as directly assigning a legal meaning to the word homicide is concerned, should stop, there should be no patching by other abstract propositions, and no explanation.

Neither murder nor manslaughter can be defined, they can only be described in terms, the meaning of which fairly admits of some discussion.

It is alleged that Coke's description of murder can be improved; it may be so, but it would probably be found on careful inquiry, that no decision that would not now be approved, has been either tacitly or avowedly founded upon it; and further, that the law has by use acquired a precision beyond what this or any other description could give. Taking, however, the best descriptions that can be given of murder, manslaughter, and homicide by negligence, and adding the definitions of the penalties, the legislative or codic part of the law would be complete.

This part would be expressed in language severely simple and concise; every offence, every distinction among offences, would be defined or described, but amplification, iteration, and explanation, would all be entirely excluded.

The result would form a chapter of a code, leaving the work itself to show the sense in which the word code is here used.

The second part of the law would consist of dicta and decisions.

Turning to the definition of homicide, we find, "causing," "sooner," "act or acts," "legal duty," "omitting,"—words, as to the meaning of which, arguments might be raised; each of these would therefore have, in the second part of the law, its own separate chapter of examples, to fix beyond dispute, its meaning. In this second part conciseness would, where necessary, be sacrificed to clearness and completeness. Decisions that had become obsolete would be excluded, and where such had been practically repealed by fictions, the fictions would also disappear.

The first part would, to any one who accepted its terms, in the sense in which they were intended to be accepted, contain the whole law entire and complete; the second part would ensure that these terms should be so accepted.

The two parts of the law, supplied with a complete index, would be submitted to the legislature together, after having received such judicial approval as might be thought necessary. The first part would be an ordinary Act of Parliament; the second would become law, after having been for a certain time, before the legislature.

As regards the alterations said to be necessary, the report says:—

“We are required to declare that negligence is not manslaughter, and suicide not murder; both, probably, salutary changes, but which should be settled on their own merits.”

The difference between doing an act negligently and doing it intentionally, although without intending to produce the consequences that result from doing it, is a natural one, and does not depend on positive law; and among the dicta and decisions, those relating to homicide by negligence would necessarily fall into a separate class. Whether the two classes should be combined, as they now are, or kept separate, the legislature would readily decide when the examples were placed before it.

The definition of homicide has been here framed so as to exclude suicide. It is believed that this is the better use of the words; but it must also be taken into account, that the actual law of suicide, as it is administered, is a fiction. It grows out of a compromise between the religious feeling that keeps suicide in the list of crimes, and the benevolent feeling that shrinks from adding a supplement to the “whips and scorns of time,” by treating it as one.

The question whether such fictions should be, where it is possible, entirely removed from the law, or should be merely prevented from doing practical harm, is one that has not been sufficiently, if it has been at all considered, and certainly it “should be settled on its own merits,” and it may therefore be taken that the law of suicide could not, at this time, properly be made part of a code.

There remains to be considered how the law can, for the future, be kept free from confusion; and, for this, a complete and efficient machinery is already in existence.

The Court for the Consideration of Crown Cases Reserved, is precisely the proper tribunal for discharging, as regards the criminal law, the functions of the committee of s. 75 of the Judicature Act, 1873.

Whenever a decision of this court should be such an one as could be usefully added to the second part of the law, whenever in the discussions of this court, it appeared that a decision or dictum, already in that part, ought to be removed: the addition, assigned to its proper place, or the removal would be provisionally made by this court, would be laid before Parliament, and would become law, by tacit confirmation.

Whenever substitution, omission or addition in the code itself, should in the discussions of this court be found to be necessary, the court could at once bring the change required to the attention of the legislature.

If the law of homicide were to be forthwith treated in this manner, the treatment would be extended to such other parts of the law, as are so far mature and complete as to admit of its application.

Such parts of the law as are rather in process of formation than actually formed, might also sometimes be improved by using this part as a type of the form that they should tend to assume.

Temple, October, 1874.

ON IDENTITY OF METHOD in the SEARCH for TRUTH.

Jurisprudence.

It is now two centuries and a half since Francis Bacon pointed out what the process is by which truth is successfully sought or discovered although unsought.

That process was called the new method. It was new to the theories of psychologists, but Bacon lived in an age of inductive labour, and to inductive labourers, the fact that the observations that they were daily and hourly indefatigably making, formed the basis of the knowledge that they sought could not fail to be at once recognized as soon as the oracle had spoken.

To men like Des Cartes, whose scientific labours called for deductive processes only, the truth or falsehood of Bacon's views was not material, and thus there were those who dissented from them. If there is little of such dissent now avowed, there are assumptions

that involve it, and which impede the operation of inductive method in more than one of the subjects to which its careful application is essential.

It might have been well if the term science had been limited to subjects in which the phenomena can be subjected to precise numerical measurement; whether because, as in astronomy, nature is herself constantly reproducing them with undeviating accuracy—or whether because, as in chemistry, she allows them to be reproduced by those who have learnt the laws of their recurrence. We speak, however, of the science of jurisprudence—the science of political economy; subjects in which the nearest approach to numerical accuracy is to be found in the columns of a statistical table—in which the facts are modified by passions, predilections, sympathies, and prejudices—in which the balance and the micrometer can be no longer used—in which we can neither make experiments at pleasure, nor watch the operation of nature's laws for the appearance of the phenomena, whose happening we can with confidence predict.

The question is, is the method of arriving at truth the same in such subjects as in those of which astronomy and chemistry are types?

By comparing the several steps in the method of seeking truth as employed in science of numerical accuracy, with processes that find their way into operation in any less certain science with which we wish to deal, we discover the necessity for employing the true method, and we find that error is inevitably introduced by any departure from it.

It may be taken, as now universally admitted, that we cannot arrive at knowledge on any subject without employing the senses to observe the phenomena that belong to it.

The share that observation and experience take in the process of arriving at truth, and the order in which their action is called for is subjected to controversy; but if it be taken that the pursuit of knowledge begins with the observation of appearances, great variety of opinion is admissible as to the part taken by the mind in arriving at a knowledge of facts from observed appearances, at laws of the phenomena from facts, and at laws of causation as far as they can be ascertained.

Taking the opinions as actually expressed by sound scientific reasoners, we find it held that the mind is a blank on which the senses write the tale of knowledge from its earliest phrase.

That the mind is stored with fundamental ideas, which the senses call into exercise.

That “the mind has been already touched by a celestial hand, and when plunged in “the colours that surround it, it comes forth covered with a glorious pattern.”

A belief in either of these propositions may coexist with the conviction that the skill, invention, and imagination that are used to frame an hypothesis, must operate on materials that the senses have assisted in accumulating—that such hypothesis cannot be treated as a fact, or as an established law, until it has been verified by additional experience—and that it must be at once abandoned, if proved by such experience to be unsound.

It is the entire or partial disregard of these principles that in jurisprudence, as in other subjects, leads to error.

In applying the Baconian method to sciences, such as jurisprudence, that are not of numerical accuracy; it is necessary to consider at what we can arrive.

We cannot acquire the ability to predict with certainty the happening of a particular event in a particular case; nor to measure with an approach to accuracy the probability that such event will happen; but we can ascertain what the events are that tend to occur, and with more or less accuracy, fix the limits within which that probability must lie.

We cannot enunciate a general law that will enable us to say that a particular family settlement will be made to contain particular provisions, nor that a particular person will become the owner of a particular estate; but we can say what the provisions are that there is a tendency to introduce into such settlements; we can say that there is an almost universal eagerness to acquire the ownership of land; that there is a tendency to display a seeming ownership when the real ownership has passed away, when its heart has been eaten out by mortgages and jointures.

We cannot say that a particular house will be destroyed by an incendiary fire, or that a particular ship will be scuttled; but we can say that the act of prudence which diffuses the loss arising from inevitable accident has a tendency to produce loss for purposes of fraud and profit.

It is experience that acquaints us with the existence of these tendencies; not exclusively the experience of lawyers, but principally so. Lawyers contrive the means by which the contracts and arrangements that men are inclined to make with each other are carried out, conduct the contests to which they lead and investigate the facts of the case when an injury has been inflicted.

The hypothesis, more or less erroneous, by which jurisprudence is affected are such as these:—

That there is a code of natural law of which the mind is intuitively cognizant, and that municipal and international law are deductions from its principles.

That moral philosophy is a science from whose principles jurisprudence must be deduced.*

That by codifying laws you necessarily substitute clearness, consistency, and simplicity for obscurity, confusion, and complexity.†

These opinions are more frequently tacitly assumed than avowed. They seem to be perversions of the fact, that there are maxims and principles that are properly called *juris præcepta*, as having been assented to by all civilized men.

With these maxims the rules of jurisprudence must accord, but they are too general to enable inductive labour in particular subjects to be dispensed with, and if they could be combined into a science it would be as a consequence of the results which that labour produces.

Codes of municipal and international law must deal with a range of subjects, our knowledge as to the several parts of which is in very different states of advancement. To make every part clear, consistent, and simple, the first step is to frame definitions that are complete, certain, and unambiguous—true when applied to any particular case, and adequate to meet every possible contingency. This first step is an impossible one. A code in the present state of our knowledge must in fact be a mere bundle of hypotheses; some have been verified by repeated use, and have become established principles; some are comparatively untried, unused, and unreliable.

A description accurately framed on the knowledge we possess at any particular time remains unviolated by additions to that knowledge. Its vagueness renders judicial skill necessary in applying it to any particular case, but that vagueness tends to be diminished by use.

A definition framed on imperfect knowledge is, on the other hand, an impediment that must be removed or evaded. It is in practice modified or got rid of by legal fiction. Its errors are met by compensating errors.

Legal fictions are proper temporary expedients, but they mark out defects that it is the duty of legislation to remove.‡

* “Poser les principes et voir les cas se plier comme d’eux-mêmes” is a method which Montesquieu, no doubt, believed that he was employing. So Locré, *Commentaire et complément des codes Français*, “toujours prendre pour point du départ les règles premières et essentielles, les principes les élémens enfin de la science.”

And Pescatore,—

“Chiedere alla metafisica le prime nozioni sull’organismo morale e giuridico, e con queste nozioni studiare il diritto, non quale si concepirebbe con false astrazione in uno stato che non esiste e non può esistere, ma quale realmente governa gli uomini e le Società: decomporre l’ufficio e il modo di azione nelle varie sfere che essa governa: e nella sfera della vita civile distinguere l’elemento giuridico razionale, l’elemento giuridico positivo e il vero rapporto che unisce e contempera i due termini; separare nella giurisprudenza la scienza dall’arte, segnare il limite in cui la scienza finisce e l’arte incomincia, stabilire il principio scientifico qual supremo regolatore dall’arte, e a questo fine costruire un sistema compiuto coi principii del gius comune, ossia della ragion giuridica naturale incui sia data *a priori* la soluzione di tutti i casi giuridici—tali sono gl’intendimenti della logica della diritto.

“La legge morale, rivellazione dell’infinito, risplende qual parte primaria e dominante nell’universo intelligibile: e da essa pure scaturisce la fonte d’ogni diritto. Ma non per questo la logica del diritto si dovrà costituire in un sistema di alta filosofia.” *Essa interroga Platone e Kant.*—LOGICA DEL DIRITTO.

† “Infatti la codificazione è una vera rivoluzione nella sfera della legislazione: essa chiama ad un tempo tutte le istituzioni giuridiche secolari ed immemorabili a render conto di sé: essa è il trionfo della ragion giuridica naturale.”—PESCATORE.

‡ Ex. Lord Coke as to murder says:—“Where a person of sound memory and discretion unlawfully killeth any reasonable creature in being, and under the King’s peace, with malice aforethought, either express or implied.”

This is not a scientific definition because the meaning of its several terms has never been, with accuracy, assigned, but it is not inaccurate, and it is practically sufficient. As, however, the line between that state of the mind which constitutes sound memory and discretion, and the morbid state for which irresponsibility may be claimed, has never been with certainty drawn—nor that between an unlawful and a justifiable or excusable homicide, nor that between the status which entitles to the protection of any particular government, and that which does not, cases of doubt are possible. When such a case arises, the court decides whether its particular facts bring it within the description.

The decisions on such cases with their facts serve to narrow, step by step, the vagueness of the description, and approximate it to the character of a definition.

This process is the right one. To frame an hypothesis that accords with ascertained facts, and leave it to be narrowed by advancing knowledge is true scientific method. The whole law of homicide is now in the hands of the Recorder of London, and it is fair to assume that it will be made a model for the perfecting of law on kindred subjects.

On the other hand, the laws as to offences against property are full of erroneous definition, and its com-

The general principles of ethics, natural or moral law, in such cases become a guide. Positive law is reconciled to them by an evasion of such of its descriptions as are inapplicable. Its errors are thus corrected, and its omissions supplied.

As the law advances the line between judicial and legislative functions becomes more definite, and legal fictions tend to disappear.

The following quotation discloses a somewhat different form of error:—

“The inquiries of the jurists are in truth prosecuted much as inquiry in physics and physiology were prosecuted before observation had taken the place of assumption. Theories plausible and comprehensive but absolutely unverified, such as the law of nature, the social compact, enjoy a universal preference over *sober reasoning into the primitive history of society and law*, and they obscure the truth not only by diverting attention from *the only quarter in which it can be found*, but by that most real and most important influence which, when once entertained and believed in, they are able to exercise on the latter stages of jurisprudence.”

The proposition that the knowledge of a less advanced period of society is the only source of the knowledge of a more advanced period is not *prima facie* probable, and any one who advances it should be prepared with the facts on which it is based. That physics and physiology have made their advance as a consequence of observation having taken the place of assumption can scarcely be a reason why primitive history should be the only quarter in which truth on any other subject can be found. The proper inference is that observation should go on taking the place of assumption wherever theories are treated as facts.

That the substitution of observation for assumption is precisely what has taken place in physiology and physics cannot either be conceded. The framing of plausible and comprehensive theories is a part of the process of seeking truth. While the facts are imperfectly known, such theories are liable to be more or less erroneous; they are corrected as the knowledge of facts increases. What has taken place in physiology and physics is, that an hypothesis is now treated as such, until it has been established as an ascertained fact by deductive method, instead of being insisted on at once as demonstrated truth, as in former times it frequently was.

The terms in which physiology and physics are spoken of in the passage quoted are pregnant with the approbation of the Baconian method: the theory advanced is not only inconsistent with that method, but is expressly repudiated by Bacon.

Rerum enim inventionem a naturæ luce petendum, non ab antiquitatis tenebris repetendum esse, is his language.

Kepler, Newton, Laplace, Hery, certainly did not find the light that they shed on knowledge, “dans les ténèbres de l'antiquité.”

The direct proof of the proposition that truth in jurisprudence must be sought by the identical process by which it has been found in other subjects, lies in the fact that if we take any maxim or principle whatever that is recognised as sound law, we find that it has been either framed or matured on the observation and experience of the period in which it was successfully enunciated.

Whether we consider the bargains that people arrange with each other, the wrongs that they inflict on each other, or the promises that they make to each other, we find that we know nothing but what observation and experience have taught; and that the parts of the law that are most advanced are those in which our experience has been the greatest.

We may use the laws that have been matured by other societies, but when we do so, we do so, as far as we use them rationally, because they are based on facts similar to the facts on which our own laws must be based, and applied under conditions similar to those under which our own laws must be applied.

The jurist who is seeking to improve the law will certainly not neglect any hint that history can give. Among his facts there are many that are permanent, and belong to the subject in every age—among the laws of the phenomena some that were successfully enunciated long ago; and there may be laws of injunction that were right in their origin, and that are right still.

There are maxims of civil law that have served the uses of Italian commerce of the middle ages, have passed into our laws with the commerce that passed into our hands, and have become a part of our commercial law. These maxims have been retained, not

pensating legal fiction, and, as a consequence, elaborate discussions on questions not material to the merits, are still possible.

To possess—to take—to carry away, are examples of verbs that have been so employed as to make it proper and necessary to accept them in a sense that differs from their ordinary meaning.

because they can be traced in primitive history, but because they are suited to existing circumstances, because they provide for existing wants.

The laws of commerce are from time to time modified to meet modified demands upon them, and to remedy their imperfections. What these imperfections are, what the proper remedies, observation and experience, and these alone, can teach. As far as the supply of current wants is concerned, the mine of antiquity is exhausted. The Phœnicians and the Rhodians can do no more for English commercial law than they have already long since done. The Triremes of Salamis can scarcely aid us in the structure of ships of war, now that Trafalgar as to this belongs to remote antiquity.

To the experience of contemporaries and the reasonings founded upon them we can look with somewhat more of hope. Our nearest neighbours have laws that are in form more scientific than our own. The account given by Locré of his elaborate labours shows that it is only in form;* but we cannot afford to overlook facts that have been ascertained, or rules that have been deduced from such facts by a civilization so near our own. American jurists have also ever been treated as contributors to English legal literature.

The proposition that truth in jurisprudence must be sought by the identical process by which it has been found in other subjects is fully recognised in the practice of instituting special inquiries in particular cases before legislating upon them.

Impartial and scientific investigation can sometimes arrive at correct results from materials thus obtained, but the process has little in common with the patient and continuous observation that belongs to true inductive method.

Special inquiry, however, the less effective mode of arriving at facts, is generally followed with reasonable speed by legislation, while the results of continuous observation, the more effective method, are frequently neglected, or more slowly used; and it is this defect in using the materials that experience supplies that keeps the law from acquiring a scientific character. The question is, How can this defect be remedied?

In true science a newly discovered fact is not for an instant disregarded, a detected error is not for an instant retained; and this promptitude must be employed to any subject that is to be approximated to the rank of a science.

If law could be framed with a complete knowledge of all the circumstances to which it could possibly be applied, and be expressed in language of unmistakeable clearness, the function of judicial authority would be simply to enforce its decrees.

In fact, however, and apart from the errors of policy, there are and ever will be errors, ambiguities, and omissions in the laws, and these as a rule can only be discovered in the actual working of the system. It is in that working also and to the minds of those who are engaged in the business of deciding, and who thus have all the facts completely before them, that are suggested the rules for grouping the discovered facts, and for removing the defects that are revealed.

It follows that the judge does, and must do, some of the work of the legislator. In very rude states of society he does it all; he makes the law as he wants it; and in any state of society he must, in deciding the particular case before him, remove any ambiguities and supply any omissions that exist, so far as it is necessary to enable him to do so.

The French Codes say:—

“Le juge qui refusera de juger sous prétexte du silence, de l’obscurité ou de l’insuffisance de la loi, pourra être poursuivi de déni de justice.”

Omission, obscurity, and insufficiency, are here assumed to be possible, and the judge is compelled to decide the particular case before him, notwithstanding their existence.

Now it is clear that by making the law meet a case that its provisions are, in fact, inadequate to meet, the law itself must have been modified. It does not, however, necessarily follow that the modification should be further used; its use may be limited to the particular occasion.

* “Les codes ont donné lieu à une triple discussion,

“L’une dans le sein du conseil où se préparait le projet,

“L’autre au Tribunal où le projet était d’abord examiné dans des conférences privées, et ensuite soumis à une discussion publique et solennelle,

“La troisième devant le corps Législatif, où il était contradictoirement débattu entre les orateurs du gouvernement et ceux du Tribunal.

“Ces deux dernières discussions ont amené des observations officieuses, des exposés de motifs, des rapports qui se placent aussi parmi les travaux préparatoires.

“C’est de tous ces travaux réunis, rapprochés, conférés au texte des codes, et entre eux que sort l’esprit de la loi. Quoique tous ne le révèlent pas également certaine, c’est là seulement qu’on le trouve. Hors de là il n’y a qu’incertitude, tâtonnement, opinion, conjecture, et souvent erreur.”

The French laws say:—*Il est défendu aux juges de prononcer par voie de disposition générale et réglementaire sur les causes qui leur sont soumises.*

“Il est défendu aux juges de prononcer par voie de disposition générale et réglementaire sur les causes qui leur sont soumises.”

And this seems to limit the uses of a decision to the particular case in which it is delivered. The English law has no such prohibition; and although there is no such special duty imposed on a court, as that of elaborating and perfecting the law as a science, yet, if the habits of thought of the judge be such as to lead him to prefer to deal with principles, he will, if general rules exist, seek to make his particular decision a deduction from them, or will, if they do not exist, elaborately investigate existing decisions on the subject and endeavour to enunciate a rule of law that will comprise them so as to make his present decision a deduction from a general rule, instead of a mere isolated decree or a slavish copy of previous decisions.

Now this is true scientific method. The actual business of the courts supplies, almost exclusively, the facts that are necessary for the use of the induction, and it also suggests the hypotheses that form the successive steps in the advance; and such of these as are enunciated as rules of law are finally tested and confirmed by this same actual employment in the real business of life.

It is, in this way, and not by actual legislation, that these maxims of law that are most nearly scientific are framed.

It is certainly not possible to avoid the use, in some way or other, of the materials that experience is constantly accumulating, but for the purposes of science the use should be continuous and systematic. Legislative and judicial authority should be made to exercise their respective functions in complete harmony.

It is no uncommon thing to hear a legislative provision denounced from the bench, as ambiguous, contradictory, capable of being evaded, or even as plainly and clearly enacting something different from what must necessarily have been intended. If such denunciations are justified they show that corrections in the law, as it exists, are necessary, and they should therefore receive immediate attention, and the corrections that are shown to be necessary should be at once applied.

Again, with whatever skill and success a general proposition of law may be enunciated by judicial authority it does not become certain law unless the authority be that of the highest court. It may be rejected in a subsequent proceeding, or adopted only after a complete rediscussion of the subject; and even when the authority of the court makes it a part of the law, it need not be, that its proper place in the system is assigned to it; it may be simply thrown upon the heap.

In the statute law there is an equal absence of scientific control. The portions of it that are in constant use, are from time to time consolidated and adapted to existing wants, and whether this is done by scientific or empirical skill, experience is the guide, the practical fitness more or less the result.

That no successful method has hitherto been applied to the mass of legislation, may be inferred from the fact, that many hundreds of statutory provisions are now in process of being carted away as obsolete, preparatory to the consolidation of the remainder.

Provisions that were operative, those which had become obsolete, and those which could not safely be pronounced, the one or the other had become mingled in undistinguishable confusion. Without the introduction of a skill, both mechanical and scientific, that has not hitherto been applied, this confusion must in a greater or less degree continue, or be renewed.

The existence, side by side, of systems that had sprung from different origins, and that appealed to altogether different principles, has been an insuperable impediment to scientific advance. To impose a matured system, however superior, on a community that already has a system of its own, must introduce anomalies that need not exist where the community and its laws have grown up together.

The Judicature Act, 1873, commences a change by which these anomalies will be, in time, removed from the English law, but beyond this, it contains, s. 75, a provision by which the necessity for continuously watching the working of the system is recognized, and by which a communication between the supreme court and the legislature through the medium of a council composed of members of the court, is to be maintained.

Ordinary rules of construction may limit the operation of this clause to the subject-matter of the Act, but as far as it goes it adopts a principle which would secure a steady, continuous, and systematic improvement of the law if it were to be applied to that object.

A council with the necessary authority, and whose members possessed both practical skill and scientific attainment, could work into the legal system principles that had been enunciated in the course of judicial decision, and deprive of the rank of authorities to be

followed such judgments as had been found to be useless or misleading. It could point out the legislation that was necessary for the remedying of defects that had been brought to its notice, and suggest or correct the mode and form necessary to be adopted so as best to arrive at accuracy, certainty, and perspicuity in legislation.

The sciences that are best suited to guide the habits of juridical thought are not to be found among those mental tonics whose axioms and postulates are admitted as soon as enunciated. Instruction must be sought in the history of those in which the entire process of arriving at knowledge from complete ignorance is revealed. Astronomy and chemistry possess this quality in an eminent degree. Each starts from appearances that deceive, passes through a maze of erroneous hypotheses, successively adopted and abandoned, and arrives at laws of the loftiest certainty and generality. Each, too, presents, during the pre-Baconian period of its history, hypothesis after hypothesis clung to and defended as demonstrated truth. Each has had its cultivators, who began *poser les principes*, before the subject-matter even had been clearly ascertained, and *chiedere alla metafisica le prime nozioni* instead of *alla sperienza*, each has appealed to history for what observation alone could teach, and each has demonstrated in the results that the loftiest scientific and the humblest domestic truths must be sought by identically the same method.

In sciences such as these professional labour is scientific labour; the knowledge that is incidentally acquired in the pursuit of gain is eagerly contributed to the general stock, and gratuitous labour is attracted by the fascination of progressive discovery. On the other hand, the mere practice of the law makes but few demands on science, and renders still fewer returns. It is pledged to the promotion, in its exertions, of individual interests.

It is to judicial and legislative labour, acting in union with each other and controlled by scientific knowledge, that the law must look for its advance.

CANTERBURY.

Sir, 6, King's Bench Walk, Temple, November 17, 1874.

The following are my observations and opinion upon the points submitted to me by circular dated 15th October last.

1. I think that it is, provided the magistrates would deal with these cases under the 46th section of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and find that they are "fit subjects for a prosecution by indictment," when the punishment provided by the 47th section might be inflicted and I would add flogging to that punishment in all these cases.

2. I think not.

3. I can see no reason for any alteration in this respect.

4. Flogging in my opinion should be authorised in all cases attended with violence, and for which convictions have taken place upon indictment. It seems to me also well worthy of consideration whether it should not be extended to the offences named in the 22nd section of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. I would not authorise flogging in cases of summary conviction.

5. I believe it has especially the offences enumerated in the 21st section, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.

The above I respectfully submit for the consideration of Mr. Secretary Cross.

I am, &c.

GEO. FRANCIS.

CHESTER.

Sir, 1, King's Bench Walk, Temple, January 16, 1875.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular upon the subject of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, and in reply to the several questions therein put to me I beg to say,—

1. With respect to convictions for assaults upon indictments, I think that the present provisions of the criminal law, so far as they relate to imprisonment and penal servitude, are sufficiently stringent.

2. I think that the jurisdiction of justices should be restricted to those assaults only in which the party assaulted does not sustain injury by the use of any instrument, or by kicking, &c.

3. I think not, being of opinion that if the assault was so aggravated as to require a greater amount of punishment than may now be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction, the case should be committed to either the assizes or the sessions.

4. I think it might be with advantage extended to aggravated assaults (committed without reference to the object of robbery, &c.) upon women and children, including carnal assaults upon young children.

5. In the district with which I am connected, the punishment of flogging for offences under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. s. 43. has been rarely inflicted, and offences under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 21. have been of such unfrequent occurrence, that my experience as to the effect of the punishment is of little value.

I have, &c.

HORATIO LLOYD,
Recorder of Chester.

CARMARTHEN.

Sir, 1, Pump Court, Temple, E.C., November 10, 1874.

I beg to forward you the following reply to the letter which you have addressed to me with reference to the present law of aggravated assaults.

I complain not of the law but of the practice with respect to cases of this character. The unpaid magistrates are disposed in these as in other cases to enlarge their jurisdiction. They frequently dispose of charges that amount in law to an unlawful wounding, or to the actual doing of bodily harm, as if they were no more than common assaults. I think there ought to be an Act passed declaratory of the law, to the effect that all cases of assaults of an aggravated kind, especially when wounds are produced by kicking or by sticks or pokers, or any other instrument, or when actual bodily harm is done, should be sent for trial to the assizes or sessions. I am strongly of opinion that no increased jurisdiction should be given to magistrates to deal summarily with cases of aggravated assaults.

It would be highly inexpedient to give to any court of summary jurisdiction the power of ordering any of Her Majesty's subjects to be flogged. This degrading punishment ought never to be inflicted except after the verdict of a jury, and then only by the order of a judge of one of the superior courts of law. Subject to this qualification, I approve of the suggestion that flogging should be added to the punishment for the crimes of wounding women or children with the intent to do grievous bodily harm or to murder. But I am of opinion that the power of ordering flogging should be limited to cases in which the jury find the intent.

I have, &c.

B. T. WILLIAMS.

CHICHESTER.

West Droyle, December 8, 1874.

1. In my opinion the law is not sufficiently stringent, and should be amended by increasing the punishment.

2. I see no reason for limiting the jurisdiction of the justices, but I would not invest them with the power of inflicting corporal chastisement.

3. I think a wider discretion might with advantage be given to the justices.

4. I certainly think flogging should be authorised, especially in cases of aggravated assaults upon women and children.

5. As I consider it has proved a wholesome deterrent in the cases referred to.

JOHN J. JOHNSON,
J. P. for Sussex and Recorder of Chichester.

CLITHEROE.

Sir,

In answer to two circulars from the Home Office, one asking for suggestions as to the summary jurisdiction of justices and mode of procedure, and the other as to the increase of their jurisdiction in cases of assault, and whether or not any further powers

than those already existing should be given to order flogging, I beg, on behalf of myself and brother justices, to offer the following suggestions:—

First, as to the summary jurisdiction and procedure,—

That the power of dealing summarily in cases of larceny, now limited to where the value of the property does not exceed 5s. should be extended to cases where the value of the property does not exceed 40s.

That the anomaly which now exists of justices being empowered to try the thief but not the receiver be abolished, and that they should have power to deal with receivers in all cases where the value does not exceed 40s.

That jurisdiction should be given in all cases where property not exceeding 40s. in value is obtained by false pretences, which at present, however small the amount, must be sent for trial at the sessions.

That in cases where the prisoner pleads guilty before justices at petty sessions the maximum term of imprisonment should be 12 months instead of six, as at present.

That instead of summonses being signed by justices, their clerk should affix an official seal, similar to the procedure in county courts.

That the justices clerk should be empowered to take recognizances, the amount being previously fixed by the justices.

That the services of all summonses should be by affidavit, as is the case under the law of bastardy.

That a record of convictions should be kept in each petty sessional division and made evidence, thus saving the expense and inconvenience of applying to the clerk of the peace.

That it be optional with the justices to commit to the assizes or sessions in cases of burglary, as at present, however trifling the case, it must be sent to the assizes, and these cases have given rise to constant complaints on the part of grand juries in having their time and that of the court taken up in cases which ought to be tried at sessions.

As to the increased jurisdiction of justices in assaults and the power of ordering flogging, I beg to suggest—

That in cases of common assault the jurisdiction should be increased from the maximum penalty of 5l. or two months' imprisonment to the maximum penalty of 10l. or three months' imprisonment.

That in aggravated assaults upon women and children under 14 the jurisdiction should be increased from the penalty of 20l. or six months imprisonment to 30l. or nine months imprisonment.

That in assaults on constables the jurisdiction should be increased as in aggravated assaults.

That on the question of flogging we are strongly of opinion that the jurisdiction should not be increased, and that such a punishment should, if at all, not be inflicted unless at the suggestion of a jury, and with the sanction of the judge.

These suggestions are made after a careful consideration of the subjects at a meeting of the justices of this division convened by me for that purpose.

I am, &c.

T. HASTINGS TRIGHAM,
Chairman of the Petty Sessional Division of
East Staincliffe, in the West Riding.

P.S.—I have received similar circulars on the above subjects addressed to me as Recorder of Clitheroe, and I request that the above suggestions may be accepted as my answer in that capacity.

DARTMOUTH.

Sir,

11, South Square, Grays Inn, October 31, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular, and regret that absence from town has prevented me answering your questions earlier, and I beg to offer all the apology I can for the delay.

I have carefully considered the questions put in reference to assaults, and I think (as far as my experience has allowed me to form an opinion) that in all crimes of violence and indecent assaults "flogging" should be extended, but at the same time should not

be placed in the hands of any tribunal which is not attended by a jury. In reference to assaults by courts of "summary jurisdiction," I think it desirable that the "maximum fine" and the "maximum term" should both be extended.

I beg, &c.

ALBERT W. BEETHAM.

DONCASTER.

Sir,

Durham, October 26, 1874.

I beg to submit the following replies to the questions contained in your circular of October 15:—

1. I think the punishments awarded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47, for aggravated assaults, and by s. 20 of the same statute for unlawfully wounding, are sufficiently severe, subject to the question whether a power to authorise flogging in such cases should not also be given. See answer to question 4.

2. I think not.

3. I think it would be desirable to extend the maximum fine and maximum term of imprisonment, which may be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction in cases of common assault; for although the present fine and term may be sufficient in trifling assaults, yet cases are often disposed of in petty sessions, and treated as common assaults, where considerable violence has been used.

4. I think flogging should be authorised in cases of assaults on women and children, in which I include rapes and attempts at rape. I also think it desirable that a court should have power to order flogging in cases of brutal assault.

5. I believe flogging to have been decidedly efficacious in putting down robbery with violence, especially garrotte robbery. From my experience, I should say that criminals dread the lash more than imprisonment, or even penal servitude.

I am, &c.

EDGAR J. MEYNELL.

DEVONPORT AND PLYMOUTH.

1. I think not. I would extend the power to flog given by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., to "assaults of brutal violence," although there may be no intent to rob, making such cases triable only at quarter sessions.

2. I think the jurisdiction of justices to deal with assaults should be confined to cases which can be satisfactorily disposed of under section 42, of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and that the jurisdiction to deal with cases under section 43 should be taken away, and that such cases should be made triable only at quarter sessions as an aggravated assault occasioning actual bodily harm, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47. Actual bodily harm need not be a permanent or dangerous injury if it seriously interferes with health and comfort. *Reg. v. Cox, Russell, and Ryans, Crown Cases, 362.*

3. No.

4. Yes; see answer to first question, and especially in the case of women and children.

5. I think so as far as it has been tried, but I think the power has not been sufficiently exercised.

I may add that I regret that the power to give three years penal servitude, which I should prefer to give to long terms of imprisonment, is taken away, and also that on convictions in small cases of larceny, where there has been a prior conviction of larceny, probably of a light character, the judge or judicial authority cannot give less than seven years penal servitude. I should often give five years in such cases had I the power, but considering seven too long feel compelled to give long terms of imprisonment instead, which I do not think so desirable.

Sir,

I have the honour to inclose the above answers to questions submitted to me by Mr. Secretary Cross.

I am, &c.

HENRY THOS. COLE,

Recorder of Plymouth, Devonport.

DOVER.

Sir,

5, Paper Buildings, Temple, November 5, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th of October last, in which you, on behalf of Mr. Secretary Cross, request my observations and opinion on five points. I have much pleasure in complying with that request.

1. I do not think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is sufficiently stringent, and I have suggested the amendments which I think it is desirable should be made in the answers to other questions.

2. I do not think there are any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I think it is desirable that the maximum fine and the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts for summary jurisdiction, should be extended.

At present, in cases where the magistrates exercise their summary jurisdiction, they can only inflict a sentence for an ordinary assault of an aggravated character by one man upon another of two months' imprisonment, or a fine of 5*l*. I see no reason why they should not have power to pass a sentence of imprisonment not exceeding four or six months generally in cases of assault. They can under 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112. pass a sentence of six months' imprisonment for an assault on a constable, and it may be worth consideration whether they should not have power to inflict an extra amount of punishment after a previous conviction, as mentioned in that section. See also 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 39 and 40, by which they have jurisdiction to impose a sentence of three months imprisonment for certain assaults therein mentioned.

I think also that they should have a general power to fine to the extent of 20*l*. It must, however, be borne in mind that the justices have power for separate and distinct offences, to order a second period of imprisonment commencing at the expiration of the first period. See the case of *Reg. v. Cutbush* and another, 36 L. J., M. C. 70.; S. C., L. R. 2; Q. B. 379.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. I think it should be inflicted in all cases of assaults of brutal violence, and especially in cases of assaults on women and children, but I would not give the power to two justices sitting in petty sessions to order flogging.

Power was given to two justices to impose a sentence of six months' imprisonment for assaults upon women and children, because in cases where two months imprisonment was deemed not to be sufficient, they were obliged to commit the offender to the assizes or sessions, and it was found that in the meantime the women assaulted, especially if a wife, afterwards, when she ceased to smart under the injuries inflicted, declined to prosecute; and it may be said that if justices in petty sessions have not the power of ordering flogging for such assaults, but are obliged to commit, the same failure of justice will take place which was prevented by the passing of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 30. s. 1, and now by section 43 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.

I have carefully considered this matter, and beg to suggest for the consideration of Mr. Secretary Cross, whether to get rid of this difficulty it would not be desirable that the justices should have power given to them, similar to that which they now have with regard to incorrigible rogues under 5 Geo. 4. c. 83. ss. 5 and 9. The injured women suffering from their wrongs immediately after the assaults would prove the offence, then the justices would convict and the conviction would stand; but if they thought it was a case which deserved more than six months' imprisonment, and especially if it was a case in which a sentence of flogging ought to be added, they could commit the offender to the House of Correction until the next general or quarter sessions, when the justices there would, as they at present do under section 10 of 5 Geo. 4. c. 83., "examine into the circumstances of the case," and order further imprisonment and the additional punishment of whipping.

The power of the justices at quarter sessions should be the power which judges have, after conviction, of generally inquiring into the circumstances of the case; and if therefore a woman refused afterwards to appear, her written deposition and the medical and other evidence would show the nature of the assault, so as to guide the justices at sessions as to the proper sentence to be passed. Besides preventing a failure of justice, the sentences passed at quarter sessions for these serious cases would become more consistent, the court consisting of a skilled chairman and numerous justices from different parts of the county, or a recorder.

I do not think there would be any great inconvenience in adopting the plan which I beg to suggest, because it will be noticed that the offender would be undergoing imprisonment with hard labour until the next quarter sessions. Of course I would not give an appeal against the conviction.

It will be seen that the quarter sessions already have the power to order an incorrigible rogue (not a female) to be whipped, and my scheme has this advantage, that the legislature has already sanctioned this course of procedure. See 5 Geo. 4. c. 83. s. 10.

With regard to incorrigible rogues, Mr. Secretary Cross could easily ascertain whether in working the 5 Geo. 4. c. 83. any difficulties have arisen.

5. Flogging has been most efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. Whenever that punishment has been tried it has effected its object, as for instance—under 5 & 6 Vict. c. 51. for offences against the Queen—under the Act dealing with juvenile offenders and in similar cases.

I may perhaps be pardoned for suggesting, if legislation is to take place upon the subject of flogging, whether boys who put stones upon railways and commit similar offences, should not be made liable to the punishment of whipping. It will be remembered that in the Consolidated Statutes power to inflict the punishment of whipping is given in cases of offences affecting railways in cases of felony, but not where the offence amounts to misdemeanor. See sections 32, 33, and 34 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and sections 35 and 36 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97.

The sections in the Consolidated Statutes authorising boys under the age of 16 to be whipped are:—16, 28, 29, 30, 32, 56, 64, and 70, of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.; sections 1 to 10, 14 to 23, 26 to 33, 35, 39, 42 to 48, 50, 54, and 75, of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97.; and sections 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 44, 46, 47, 67, 68, 74, 91, 95, 101, and 119, of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96.

I know how much Mr. Secretary Cross's time is engaged, but if he should think that any suggestion made by me is worthy of further consideration, I shall be glad to wait upon him or yourself at any time you may be pleased to appoint.

I am, &c.

HARRY BODKIN POLAND.

DURHAM.

ANSWERS to the QUESTIONS contained in Mr. SECRETARY CROSS'S LETTER of the 15th October 1874.

Sir, City of Durham, Nov. 12, 1874.

In answer to your questions as to the more effectual repression of the prevailing crimes of violence, I beg to reply to them seriatim in the enclosed paper.

I have, &c.

J. BRAMWELL,

Recorder of Durham.

1. I am of opinion that the penal law in such cases is not sufficiently stringent; and that it should be amended by an increased amount of fines, and of the term of imprisonment.

2. There are no such assaults which require any further enactment, because, in the present and existing state of the law, the justices are empowered to send any cases of aggravated assault to the assizes or quarter sessions for trial.

3. I think it is desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment to be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction, should be extended.

4. I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., especially in the cases named.

5. I believe that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised by the Act referred to.

J. BRAMWELL,
Recorder of the City of Durham.

FOLKESTONE.

Sir,

The Cottage, Sandgate, Nov. 11, 1874.

I have the honour to send you, in compliance with the request of Mr. Secretary Cross, the following answers to the questions submitted to me by your letter of the 15th October last.

1. I don't think the law against brutal assaults is sufficiently stringent. I think sect. 18 of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, includes all such assaults as I suppose it is wished specially to legislate against, *e.g.*, assaults by kicking, or using any dangerous weapon or instrument, though magistrates frequently choose to deal with them summarily as common assaults; but I would add to the stringency of that section by giving the court power in its discretion to add flogging. If this be done, I do not see, however, upon principle how that punishment can be restricted to the offences mentioned in that section; it ought, as it seems to me, to be extended to manslaughter, attempts to murder, and all felonious assaults punishable under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.

2. I think assaults by kicking or using any dangerous weapon or instrument should be declared not triable at petty sessions.

3. I think not, if the jurisdiction of courts exercising summary procedure be confined strictly to common assaults.

4. See answer to question No. 1. But I would not authorise flogging in cases of assaults upon wives, unless that punishment were allowed to have the effect of a judicial separation.

5. The offences for which flogging is authorised as a punishment by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. have been much less frequent since the passing of that Act; it is fair therefore to presume that flogging has been efficacious in putting them down.

I have, &c.

W. LONSDALE,

Recorder of Folkestone,
and J. P. for Kent and the West Riding
of Yorkshire.

GRANTHAM.

Sir,

1, Paper Buildings, Temple, November 5, 1874.

I have great pleasure in answering, so far as I am able, the questions proposed in your letter of October 15th, premising that my experience as a recorder dates only from the commencement of this year, although I have practised for over 12 years at the Birmingham and Warwickshire Sessions.

1. I think that with regard to punishment other than flogging the present penal law against brutal assaults is sufficiently stringent. Under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47, quarter sessions have power to sentence to five years penal servitude or two years imprisonment for assaults occasioning actual bodily harm, which, in practice, must occur in all brutal cases, and if there be an intention to do grievous bodily harm or the like, it can be fully dealt with at the assizes.

My experience has been that magistrates scarcely ever commit the former class of cases for trial, and, until they do so, it would seem unreasonable to say that the law, not having been thoroughly put in force, is ineffectual.

2. In my opinion it should be made compulsory on magistrates to send for trial all persons committing aggravated assaults, as defined by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47, if they have been once previously convicted of an assault which has been punished by imprisonment without option of fine. If it be decided to inflict flogging the committal should be to the assizes.

3. I consider that the powers of courts of summary jurisdiction are quite large enough. A fine of whatever amount is no deterrent in cases of brutality, and magistrates have already power to sentence to six months hard labour, and in addition to require sureties to keep the peace. For any punishment beyond this I think that there ought to be a right of trial by jury.

4. Flogging might perhaps be useful in cases of assaults on women and children where there was great brutality, and also in bad assaults in general where two or more persons attacked another. In such cases magistrates should commit to the assizes, and they, of course, would only do so where the facts were such that in their opinion a

flogging might be desirable. In this way they would have to some extent a veto on this punishment.

The flogging of grown-up men is a very different matter from the whipping of boys and children, and if allowed to be enforced by any one but a judge would probably excite criticism and engender discontent.

5. I am not in a position to be able to afford any information on this point.

I have, &c.

JOHN S. DUGDALE,
Recorder of Grantham.

P.S.—Referring to my letter of yesterday in answer to the Home Office inquiries respecting punishments for assaults, I find that I was mistaken in supposing that magistrates had power to inflict six months hard labour, and therefore I wish to say that I think that their powers of imprisonment should be enlarged to this extent.

GRAVESEND.

Sir

2, Plowden Buildings, Temple, November 3, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 15th ulto., requesting my reply to certain questions with reference to measures which the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department contemplates adopting for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

1 and 3. In reply to the first question, I assume that it refers to assaults upon men as well as women. In that case I do not think that the law is sufficiently stringent. The present state of the law allows at most but two months' imprisonment for assaults upon men. I think that magistrates ought to have a discretionary power to pass a sentence of imprisonment up to six months in cases of assault with brutal violence, so as to assimilate the punishment with that imposed by the Aggravated Assaults Act, which now only applies to women and children of both sexes under 14 years of age, so that magistrates might, in dealing with such assaults upon men, be empowered to pass the same sentence, viz., six months' imprisonment with hard labour, and, if desirable, to hold the offender to bail for six months longer. I think also that where the punishment is in the alternative, "fine or imprisonment," the former ought to be increased to about 20%, and that the magistrate ought to have the power of ordering a portion of it to be paid to the sufferer.

In the above I have necessarily been obliged to anticipate my reply to the 3rd question.

4. With regard to assaults upon women and children I think that flogging would tend to check such offences. It has invariably been found true that men who inflict bodily pain upon others without the slightest remorse are the least tolerant of pain when they are the subjects of it themselves. I think it would be attended with beneficial effects and ought to be authorised in those cases. But I am of opinion that it would be a very dangerous weapon to place in the hands of magistrates generally. Nor do I think the objections to it would be removed by requiring it to be exercised by three or more magistrates, because one of them might be a guiding spirit, the others being nominally present to meet the requirements of the law, so that the decision would be virtually that of one and one too whose temper and mind had not undergone legal training which so well qualifies a man for the judicial office, I therefore cannot recommend flogging to be entrusted to the discretion of magistrates generally, as severe punishment like that should be ordered by a court presided over by a legally educated judge after trial and verdict of assizes. I should extend the punishment of flogging to all cases of brutal assault, and should remove them from the summary jurisdiction of magistrates and make them triable at quarter sessions.

2. I should not burden the assizes with those cases, but would make them triable at quarter sessions.

3. I think that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I beg leave respectfully to submit the foregoing replies to the questions addressed to me.

I have, &c.

STANDISH GEO. GRADY,
Recorder of Gravesend.

GUILDFORD.

1. This penal law should be made more stringent by giving power to the judges to order a flogging, but the power should be restricted to the judges.
2. No.; the justices send all cases of serious assault to assize or quarter sessions.
3. No.; but power should be given to justices to award compensation to the extent of 50% for injury inflicted.
4. Yes; in all cases of brutal violence at the discretion of the judge who tries the case.
5. Yes.

Sir,

Such are my observations and opinion as to the questions submitted above.

I have, &c.

G. C. NORTON,
Recorder of Guildford.

HELSTON.

Sir,

4, Brick Court, Temple, January 11, 1875.

I beg to trouble you with the following observations in answer to the questions which you have done me the honour to submit to me with reference to the repression of crimes of violence:—

1. I do not think that the penal laws against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, are in all cases sufficiently stringent. I think there are cases in which it would be expedient to amend the law by authorising flogging.

2. I do not think that there are any kinds of assaults which may now be summarily punished which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions. But I do not think that the magistrates in petty sessions should, under any circumstances, be authorised to inflict the punishment of flogging. Indeed, I am not prepared to say that I would confer this power upon the quarter sessions. I am inclined to think that in all cases in which flogging may be authorised, and in which the justices at petty sessions may deem the offences deserving of flogging, they should be directed to commit to the assizes.

3. I think it may be expedient that the maximum of fine which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended; but I do not think it desirable to extend the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed by such courts.

4. I think flogging should be authorised in certain cases of brutal assaults by males on women and children; and I am inclined to think also that it would be expedient to authorise the flogging of all males guilty of the crimes comprised in section 28 of the statute 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., and also of those comprised in section 29 of that statute when bodily injury is effected, instead of limiting the power of flogging, as at present, to the cases of males under the age of 16 years. These crimes are of a most cowardly character; they are ordinarily perpetrated with design and malice aforethought; and from the secret and underhand way in which they are carried out, it is in many cases impossible for the victim to protect himself from the attack. I am not at present prepared to say that there is any other case in which I think flogging should be authorised.

5. I have no sufficient data to enable me to form an opinion satisfactory to myself as to whether flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. But my belief is that it has been so to a considerable extent. I am persuaded that there are many men of low and brutalised natures, who have a much more vivid dread of the lash than they have of either imprisonment with hard labour or penal servitude.

I have, &c.

C. G. PRIDEAUX.

IPSWICH.

November 6, 1874.

I have the honour to submit, for the consideration of the Right Hon. the Home Secretary, the following answers to the questions:—

1. Subject to the answer to question 4, I think the law is sufficiently stringent if properly enforced, but a practice has sprung up, encouraged by notions of economy, under which such offences are dealt with either by the magistrate themselves in a summary way, or the case is sent as a minor offence to be tried at quarter sessions instead of assizes. This was done very recently in the case of Fitzgerald, who, having broken almost every bone in his wife's body with an iron fender, was sent by the magistrates to be tried, and was tried at the Middlesex sessions, for unlawfully wounding, for this he received the extreme sentence for that offence, five years penal servitude. He ought clearly to have been sent to the Central Criminal Court, where he would have been tried for wounding with intent to kill or to do grievous bodily harm, and would have received a sentence of penal servitude for life, or for a very long term. This shows that the fault is not in the state of the law but in the mode of execution.

2. It follows that in my opinion such grave and violent injuries ought not to be treated summarily, and that directions should be given to send the very grave cases to the assizes or to the Central Criminal Court.

3. I am of opinion that six months imprisonment is the full term which should be entrusted to a magistrate, and that if a heavier punishment be required for the offence, the prisoner should not be deprived of his trial by jury. That therefore the maximum should not be extended.

4. In my opinion the assizes and the Central Criminal Court (but not courts of quarter sessions), should have power to order flogging in every case of intentional violence causing grave injury, and in cases of carnal connexions with children under twelve.

I may add, though with quite a different motive, that the power to whip small boys who place obstructions upon railways is a power very much wanted. For all judges find a difficulty in dealing with these cases. They, of course, do not like to imprison these boys, and yet they must in some way check what is a very serious evil.

5. In my opinion flogging has been the most effectual remedy yet applied.

WILLIAM JAMES METCALFE.

Recorder of Ipswich.

LEEDS.

Sir, Crown Office Row, Inner Temple, November 10, 1874.

I have the honour to forward the following observations containing the opinions asked for by your circular of the 15th October last, attached hereto, to the five questions put thereby:—

1. In two crimes of felony, of which a principal ingredient is brutal violence, *i.e.* one under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 21, in which crime is effected by violence, popularly known as garotting, and also again under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. s. 43, when robbery is effected by violence of one armed or of several in company, there is added, beyond the extreme punishments provided by these statutes respectively for such crimes, a further punishment, under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44, for adults, of three private whippings, each of 50 strokes.

The object of adding the punishment of whipping in these several instances was to suppress the element of brutal violence, by visiting those who inflicted it on others with punishments of a kindred and appropriate nature.

In a third case of brutal violence, where a like amount might be employed though without the purpose of effecting a felonious crime, *i.e.* under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43, but which involves assaults of an aggravated nature upon females and boys under 14 years of age, the extreme punishment is either six months' imprisonment with hard labour, or a fine of 20*l.* with costs.

In this third instance, although the degree of crime in the absence of any felonious purpose, is not the same as above, the object of suppressing brutal violence, and therefore of visiting those who inflict it on others, with punishment of a kindred and appro-

priate nature, ought to be the same, and therefore where the same object is the reason for acting, the same degree of punishment should be applied.

2. This third case of offences by using brutal violence, or, as the statute terms it, assaults of an aggravated nature is made subject to summary jurisdiction. Charges under this head are almost always capable of the simplest and most direct proof, and thus need no intervention of a jury.

The fitting degree of punishment to be awarded is matter with which the jury are not concerned.

To declare these offences triable only at assizes and quarter sessions, turns only therefore on the amount of punishment to be awarded as a question of fitness.

The relative capacities of magistrates when summarily dealing with these offences, and of judges and others when trying such cases with a jury, to award condign punishments for the same are always of so fluctuating a standard as to defy any estimate of value, as between them.

3. The fine of 20*l.* seems quite out of place as punishment in these last cases, and contrasted with the two other cases of brutal violence, the term of six months' imprisonment seems inadequate. Fines should be abolished.

4. Yes; and founded on the remarks made above to question No. 1.

5. In cases where it becomes publicly known that flogging has been awarded and inflicted, the effect has been reported to be of great force on the classes addicted to the use of extreme violence.

I have, &c.

J. B. MAULE,

Recorder of Leeds.

LINCOLN.

Sir, 4, Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C., December 5, 1874.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your circular of the 15th of October last, and transmit the following answers to the questions therein put to me:—

1. I see no reason to think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent.

A person convicted at the assizes of wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm may be sentenced to penal servitude for life.

A person convicted at the assizes or sessions of an assault occasioning actual bodily harm may be sentenced to penal servitude for five years.

I believe these punishments to be sufficient, and there is in my opinion no proof whatever that they have been tried and found to be ineffectual.

2. In my opinion it is desirable that assaults of brutal violence should not be disposed of summarily, but such assaults differ in degree, not in kind, from trifling assaults; and, as the magistrates will have to judge whether they fall within the one class or the other, there is some practical difficulty in framing a distinction. It might, however, be enacted that cases of assault by which the life of the person assaulted was endangered, or by which he suffered or was in danger of suffering mutilation should not be dealt with summarily. I think that there can be no doubt that a conviction at the assizes or quarter sessions has, from its greater publicity and independently of any difference in the punishment, a greater deterring effect on the public at large than summary conviction.

3. In my opinion it is not desirable to extend the jurisdiction of magistrates. The present prevalence of crimes of violence is in my opinion due to the failure of magistrates to exercise with sufficient vigour the powers now entrusted to them, and I think that to extend their power would only increase the evil, by diminishing the number of cases sent for trial at the assizes or quarter sessions.

4. In my opinion it is not desirable to authorise the punishment of flogging until the punishments now authorised by law have been tried and found wanting. I am of opinion that courts of assizes and quarter sessions already possess sufficient powers to punish adequately crimes of brutal violence if the magistrates would only commit for trial persons guilty of such offences, instead of inflicting an inadequate sentence of fine or imprisonment. It would in my opinion be absurd to give to courts of assize and quarter sessions the power of flogging when the magistrates could prevent its infliction, as they now prevent the infliction of the punishment already authorised, by dealing summarily with the persons brought before them.

5. Flogging has in my opinion been efficacious in putting down the crimes referred to in the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., but the persons who were subjected to it belonged to the criminal classes, and other punishments had been found inefficacious. Persons guilty of assaults of brutal violence, where there is no intention to rob, do not, as a rule, belong to the criminal classes, and in my opinion it is undesirable to have recourse to a brutalizing and degrading punishment until the ordinary punishments have been proved to be insufficient.

I am, &c.

LEWIS WM. CAVE,
Recorder of Lincoln.

LIVERPOOL.

Sir, Temple, November 10, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular letter of 15th October 1874, with reference to measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, and I beg to answer the questions therein contained as follows:—

1. I think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not at present sufficiently stringent. I think it should be amended by giving to quarter sessions a larger power than they at present possess of giving penal servitude to persons convicted of maliciously wounding or causing grievous bodily harm. At present the punishment for such an offence when treated as a misdemeanor, in which form alone it can come to sessions, is limited to five years penal servitude. The same punishment can be given for any assault resulting in actual bodily harm although without malice. Most malicious and brutal assaults can doubtless be dealt with as felonies at the assizes, but magistrates have for some reason a great reluctance to send them there, and it results that very atrocious crimes are frequently sent to sessions as misdemeanors only.

I am also of opinion that both assizes and quarter sessions should have the power of flogging for brutal assaults, subject, however, to a finding by the jury upon a count charging the assault to have been brutal and malicious.

2. I think that magistrates should be bound to send to assizes or sessions every case of assault which they find to be malicious or brutal, or rather that they should be deprived of summary jurisdiction over any assault, unless they find in their convictions that it was not malicious or brutal. My experience leads me to think that magistrates do much harm by dealing summarily with large numbers of crimes of violence, which I believe that they do chiefly from economical reasons, but also partly from the fear that justice will be defeated by the relenting of the prosecutors before the trial. I admit that this risk exists to a certain extent, but I believe that magistrates are in the habit of greatly over-rating it.

3. I do not think that either the powers of fining or imprisoning of courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended. I am myself strongly of opinion that courts of summary jurisdiction have in these and other matters quite as much power at present as is at all consistent with the liberty of the subject.

4. I have already said that I think that courts of assizes and quarter sessions ought to have the power of flogging for brutal assaults, expressly found to be brutal by a jury. I do not think this power ought to be confined to assaults on women and children. The only reason which, as it seems to me, can be urged for so confining it, is that in those cases the objects of the assaults are more helpless and the assault itself more cowardly than usual. But in the case of kicking inflicted upon a man, the object has generally been first rendered as helpless as a woman or a child, and the injury is inflicted in a manner as cowardly as it is brutal.

5. I think that flogging has been most efficacious in restraining and preventing the increase of the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. It has not put them down, but having regard to the state of things when the statute was passed and the state of things now existing, I think that flogging has prevented the very great increase which would probably otherwise have taken place in the class of crime dealt with by the statute.

I have, &c.

JOHN B. ASPINALL,
Recorder of Liverpool.

LUDLOW.

Sir,

1, Elm Court, Temple, E.C.

I have considered the questions forwarded to me by you on behalf of the Home Secretary, and have the honour to enclose herewith my opinions thereon.

I am, &c.

GEO. BROWNE.

1. The term "brutal violence" does not occur, as far as I am aware, in any statute. The words used in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47, as defining aggravated assaults, are "assaults occasioning actual bodily harm," words which are obviously too large here. By "brutal violence," I understand assaults occasioning danger to life, limb, or health, or causing permanent injury. I am of opinion that the present law against such assaults is insufficient, and that it should be amended by giving the court before whom the case is tried, the power of adding flogging.

2. Strictly speaking, no alteration is required in the way of a transfer of jurisdiction, but it is notorious that cases of assaults of extreme violence are dealt with by courts of summary jurisdiction. I should recommend, therefore, that assaults of brutal violence be defined as above, and that the power of determining such should be taken away, expressly, from the courts of summary jurisdiction and transferred to the courts of assize or quarter sessions.

3. Taking the above view, I think not. It is not desirable in my opinion to give the courts of first instance power to deal with assaults of brutal violence, and an increase of their power of punishment would only tempt them to deal with cases which should be tried by a superior tribunal. Nor do I think it desirable that courts of first instance should have the power of inflicting flogging, as magistrates, whether paid or unpaid, are extremely sensitive to the sudden fluctuations of public opinion, and are liable to be swayed (quite honestly I believe) by private views and information, and in cases involving the punishment of flogging, it is safer to have a more important tribunal. The time, moreover, that must elapse between the alleged offence and its punishment is a guarantee of some value against hasty judgments.

Although I have a high opinion of magistrates, it is impossible to suppose that their decisions can command the same public confidence as is obtained by the regular trial at assizes or quarter sessions, when the facts are fully gone into before a jury.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for all kinds of brutal violence. It is impossible not to see that offences against property, especially against trade or commerce as forgery or perjury, when it touches property, are treated with great severity, when compared with the sentences pronounced against offences to the person. Even now, in adults, flogging is practically limited to cases where violence is used in conjunction with an offence against property.

I would make no distinction between women and children and other persons. The old, the bedridden, infirm, idiots, and the like, are as much at the mercy of others as women or children; and the hands of justice would be hampered if punishments were to be awarded, not according to the nature of the offence, but according to the sex or age of the sufferer. I think most efficacious. I have often heard prisoners ask for an increase of the term of their imprisonment, when sentenced, for the sake of obtaining a better diet, or other reasons. When I hear a prisoner asking for more flogging, I shall alter my present opinion.

With a view of facilitating legislation on the above points, I would call attention to the 7 & 8 Geo. 4. c. 28. s. 8, a statute still in force, though frequently overlooked.

I have, &c.

GEO. BROWNE.

MAIDSTONE.

Sir,

Lamb Building, Temple, November 9, 1874.

I have the honour to forward herewith my answers to the questions laid before me by you, relating to the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

I am, &c.

R. H. B. MARSHAM.

1. I think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent, and should be amended by allowing the punishment of flogging to be administered in such cases, if committed by males, on any persons whether males or females, and to the same extent as in the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I do not consider it desirable to allow courts of summary jurisdiction to have the power of sentencing to flogging, but I would confine that power to courts of assize or of quarter sessions. I think that it is inexpedient to attempt to define "brutal violence," and consider that it will be better for the jury in each case, acting under the direction of the person presiding, to find whether such violence have been committed, and to give to them the power to negative such violence, and to find the accused guilty of an assault occasioning actual bodily harm, or of a common assault.

I beg to suggest a section founded on the first part of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47.

2. I think the cases of aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14, within the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43, should not be triable summarily, and that that section should be repealed, and then such cases would be tried under the section which I have suggested above, or under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 49.

3. I think that it is not desirable to extend the punishment, which may be imposed summarily for assaults, as magistrates might be tempted to deal summarily with bad cases instead of committing them for trial, if they had increased powers of punishment.

4. I am strongly of opinion that flogging should be administered in all cases where males are guilty of using brutal violence to any person, as I think that such crimes are very prevalent at the present time, and are on the increase; and are usually committed by men of a cowardly disposition, and that there is no kind of punishment which such men dislike and dread so much as corporal punishment, preferring any term of imprisonment, however long, to a sound flogging. It seems to me that the fact of using brutal violence, shows such a degraded state of mind, that flogging cannot have the effect of lowering the self-esteem of the men using it, and thereby of making him a worse member of the community than he otherwise would have been. I think also that, inasmuch as acts of brutal violence are more frequently perpetrated by husbands on their wives, than in any other cases, a long imprisonment of the husband makes the wife suffer by reason of his inability to earn wages, and, moreover, whilst in prison he is kept at the expense of the State. For these reasons, therefore, it seems to me more desirable that the punishment in such cases should be increased by the application of the lash, than by a lengthened term of imprisonment.

5. The offences for which flogging may be administered, by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. have not been common of late years in the south of England, with the exception of the metropolis, but certainly in the metropolis, and (judging by the public reports) in other parts of England also, flogging has been very efficacious in suppressing such crimes.

Though hardly within the scope of these questions, I may perhaps be allowed to suggest that an alteration in the law affecting attempts to rape is desirable. As the law stands at present, a person convicted of an attempt to rape is liable only to fine and imprisonment, with or without hard labour; a person convicted of an assault with intent to commit a felony, which is the usual charge where the offence is charged as a substantive one, is liable only to two years' imprisonment, with or without hard labour, and in addition to a fine, and to enter into recognizances and find sureties under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 71; and this is the same punishment as for an indecent assault, which is always considered a minor offence. I would recommend that a person convicted of an attempt to rape, or an assault with intent to commit rape, should be liable to penal servitude for five years, or imprisonment not exceeding two years with or without hard labour, and I venture to suggest a section founded on s. 62 of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. I also wish to recommend that a person convicted of an attempt to unlawfully and carnally know and abuse a girl under ten should be made liable to penal servitude for five years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years with or without hard labour; and I would amend the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 52, by making the second offence charged in it to apply to carnal knowledge of any girl between ten and twelve.

I wish to add that I would recommend a section to be inserted in the new Act, to empower the court, before which any case under the provisions of the Act is prosecuted or tried, to order the costs of the prosecution to be paid in the same manner as in cases of felony.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

2, Doctor Johnson's Buildings, Temple,
 Sir, November 10, 1874.

I have carefully considered the questions submitted in your circular of 15th October.

It is a remarkable fact that during the 20 years I have held office as recorder of Newcastle-on-Tyne, no case has come before me followed by conviction in which punishment by flogging would in my opinion have been properly administered.

Magistrates deal summarily with all cases of assault unattended with "wounding." And what are known as "garotte robberies" are sent to the assizes, under the absurd distinction which deprives recorder of the jurisdiction to try them. I cannot therefore throw much light on the queries as to which my opinion is invited.

But with respect to question 4 I should like to say this: "brutal" acts of "violence" (which occur more frequently in the metropolis than in the country) are generally committed by husband and wife.

If you flog the husband you will for ever degrade him as a married man. Let him be flogged by all means; but why not amend the laws of divorce, and in cases of conviction for "brutal violence" entitle the wife, on simple proof of conviction, to a divorce a vinculo?

Otherwise for the wife's sake the hopeless degradation of her husband is most undesirable.

I am, &c.

W. DIGBY SEYMOUR,
 Recorder of Newcastle-on-Tyne.

NEWARK.

1, Doctor Johnson's Buildings, Temple,
 Sir, November 13, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th ultimo, and to reply to the questions proposed therein as follows:—

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is, in my opinion, not sufficiently stringent, and should be amended by abolishing the discretionary exercise of summary jurisdiction which magistrates at present possess with respect to such offences.

2. In accordance with the above view, I think that aggravated assaults within the provisions of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43, and every assault accompanied by any circumstance of aggravation should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I do not think it desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. In my judgment, flogging should be authorised for all assaults within the exclusive jurisdiction of assizes and quarter sessions; and in the event of magistrates being deprived of their summary jurisdiction in cases of aggravated assaults on women and boys under 14 years of age, in accordance with the view I have expressed in my answer to your second question, I think that flogging should be authorised for such last-named offences.

It seems to me inexpedient that magistrates sitting in petty sessions should have the power to order the last in cases of assault.

5. I believe that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

Finally, I venture to suggest that, as a warning to others, flogging should be administered in the presence of a certain class of the culprit's male fellow-prisoners, such class consisting of those who, whether before or during their incarceration, have manifested a propensity to acts of violence.

I have, &c.

JOHN J. H. SAINT.

NORTHAMPTON.

November 18, 1874.

The Committee also reported that they had considered a letter from Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, and which was annexed to their report, and after such consideration they were of opinion that the law should be altered as follows:—

First. As to questions 1, 2, and 4. That in all cases of brutal violence on any person, and aggravated assaults on women and children, magistrates should have power to remit the case for trial at assizes, and the Court should have power to award flogging in addition to the present punishment.

Secondly. As to question 3. That the law should be left in the present state.

Thirdly. As to question 5. That this Committee have no knowledge except by repute of the effect of flogging under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

The above report was received and approved of by the Court, and it is ordered that that the deputy chairman of quarter sessions be requested to forward a copy thereof to Her Majesty's Secretary of State.

By the Court.

HENRY PHILIP MARKHAM,
Clerk of the Peace.

NOTTINGHAM.

Sir, 12, Lowndes Square, S.W., November 21, 1874.

In reply to your letter respecting the expediency of extending the provisions of the Act of Victoria, I beg to state that during the 36 years that I have been Recorder of Nottingham I have no recollection of any case of brutal violence being brought before me.

I can see no reason for retrograde legislation. During the greater part of the present century the legislature has been employed in mitigating the barbarity of the criminal law, and its humanity has been justified by its results.

I will only venture to suggest that, if it be thought proper to extend the provisions of the Act, the cases to which they are applicable should be tried only at the assizes.

I have, &c.

RICHARD WILDMAN.

OXFORD.

Sir, 42, Wimpole Street, January 2, 1875.

In reply to your circular requesting my views as to the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, I have the honour to state that in my opinion flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., but that the power of imposing such punishment should be limited to the judges of assize, and be allowed only in cases of brutal violence.

I have, &c.

WM. HENRY COOKE, Q.C.,
Recorder of Oxford.

READING.

Sir, Thursday, January 7, 1875.

Directed by the Recorder, I beg leave herewith to enclose a copy of the presentment made by the grand jury this day at the Epiphany Quarter Sessions, 1875, suggesting the infliction of corporal punishment in cases of brutal violence.

I am, &c.

J. OSBERT WHATLEY,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

Borough of Reading,
in the County of Berks,
to wit. } At the general quarter sessions of the peace of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, holden in and for the borough of Reading, in the county of Berks, at the assize courts of the county of Berks in the said borough, on Thursday the 7th day of January, in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five, before James Olliff Griffiths, Esquire, barrister-at-law, recorder, and one of Her Majesty's justices of the peace acting in and for the said borough.

The following presentment was made by the grand jury: "That in the opinion of the grand jury it is desirable that additional power should be given to the justices and courts of quarter sessions in dealing with cases of brutal violence against the person, and that corporal punishment may be inflicted in all cases where the justices shall consider it necessary."

" 7th January 1875.

" (Signed) JOHN VINDEN,
Foreman."

RICHMOND.

Sir, 22, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, November 2, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th ult., and to submit, for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, the following observations and opinions on the questions therein contained:—

1. I think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is not sufficiently stringent. In addition to the suggestions embodied in my answers to the other questions, I think that in cases of "unlawful wounding" (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 20) and in cases of "assaults occasioning actual bodily harm" (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47), the court should in extreme cases have power to order a longer term of penal servitude than five years, which is the limit fixed by the above sections and the 27 & 28 Vict. c. 47. s. 2.

2. The only limitation, as I understand, at present to the power of the justices to deal summarily with cases of assault is contained in the 46th section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., where they are required to send to the sessions or assizes all cases of assault accompanied by any attempt to commit felony, or in which they shall be "of opinion that the same are from any circumstance fit subjects for prosecution by indictment." It would seem, therefore, that there may be cases of assault which are within the sections 20 and 47 above quoted, but which may be dealt with summarily if the justices do not think the matter a fit subject for indictment. I think that all extreme cases of assaults coming within the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 20 and 47, should be declared liable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I think that the justices should be expressly authorised to deal summarily with the minor cases of assault "occasioning actual bodily harm," and of "unlawful wounding," and that for such cases the maximum term of imprisonment which may be ordered by the justices should be increased. The 43rd section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., which deals with aggravated assaults on females and boys under 14, would seem to suggest the form which any such new power to the justices might take. I would, however, suggest that in cases so dealt with there should be no option of a fine.

4. I think that flogging should be authorised for "assaults occasioning actual bodily harm," and for "unlawfully wounding," and for the offence of malicious wounding, &c., with intent to maim, &c. (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 18), especially in cases of assaults on women and children. But I think that in no case should flogging be authorised except after conviction by a jury.

5. I am not in a position to express a satisfactory opinion on this question.

I am, &c.

W. N. LAWSON.

SEAFORD.

Sir, Cissbury, Worthing, November 4, 1874.

I have the honour of sending answers to each of your questions on this subject.

1. I think the law is not sufficiently stringent, and I should suggest the infliction of more severe punishments.

2. I should not be disposed to contract the jurisdiction of magistrates in any case.

3. I think the maximum of punishment might be safely fixed at 12 months imprisonment.

4. I am strongly of opinion that flogging should be authorised in all cases where there should be no question as to the assault being of a cowardly character, *i.e.* in those cases where there is a great and palpable disproportion of strength in the assaulter and assaultee.

5. I have a decided conviction that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences as authorised by an existing statute; and a common objection to it, that it brutalizes the sufferer, is effectively answered by replying that one who uses brutal violence in perpetrating a robbery is not capable of being further brutalized.

I am, &c.

HUGH WYATT,

Recorder of Seaford and Justice of the
Peace for Sussex.

SALISBURY.

October 24, 1874.

1. I have no experience as to this and cannot reply.

2. All aggravated and brutal assaults should be triable at the assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I think not, and am against increasing the power or scope of the summary jurisdiction. A solemn trial before a court is much more efficacious for the prevention of crime than a private hearing before justices, which has always the air of a compromise.

4. Assuredly yes, and I would extend it to attempts to commit unnatural crimes.

5. In my belief it is so.

JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS.

Recorder of Salisbury.

SCARBOROUGH.

Dear Sir, 3, Essex Court, Temple, E.C., November 3, 1874.

In answer to the communication from the Home Office of the 15th of October last, and the six queries it contains, I beg respectively to submit the following observations and suggestions:—

1. I think there should be an additional power of ordering persons convicted of assaults of brutal violence to be privately whipped, but I think also that such a power should not be exercised by justices at petty sessions. Indeed, I should prefer that its exercise should be restricted to the judges of assize and general gaol delivery.

The unfortunate prevalence of such assaults may possibly have arisen to some extent from the omission of magistrates to commit for trial at assizes or quarter sessions persons charged with assaults instead of dealing with such cases summarily. Brutal assaults seem naturally to involve a "wilful and malicious wounding," or "the infliction of "grievous bodily harm," or "actual bodily harm," the punishment for which, on conviction by indictment, may extend to five years penal servitude or two years imprisonment with hard labour (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 18. and 47; 27 & 28 Vict. c. 47. s. 2.)

2. I think it better to leave it to the discretion of justices to commit for trial instead of dealing summarily with a charge of assault, under section 46 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100., or an extension, if necessary, of that section. It is difficult practically to fetter the discretion and judgment of magistrates as to when an indictable offence is made out before them. See *Wilkinson v. Dutton*, 32 L. J., M. C. 152.

3. I do not think it is desirable that the maximum fine or term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. I think that flogging should be authorised in all cases of assault, with amount to the wilful infliction of grievous or actual bodily harm, or unlawful and malicious wounding, whatever the age or sex of the individual assaulted.

5. I think flogging has been efficacious in checking the offences for which it is authorised by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I am, &c.

A. W. SIMPSON,

Recorder of Scarborough.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Sir,

The Sea, Winchester, November 18, 1874.

In reply to your letter addressed to me at the request of Mr. Secretary Cross, I beg to say as follows:—

1. I think the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is sufficiently stringent.

2. I do not think there are any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I do not think it is desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., and especially in cases of assaults on women or children.

5. So far as my limited experience enables me to form an opinion on the subject, I think flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I am, &c.

THOMAS GUNNER.

SUDBURY.

1. I think it is, but would sometimes be more effective if the flogging part of the punishment were optionally public (*i.e.* in a cattle market where there is one).

2. Yes; assaults upon women.

3. No.

4. Yes; in all assaults upon women where the perpetrator is a male; and when committed in a state of intoxication, it should be compulsory.

5. Yes.

THOS. H. NAYLOR,

Recorder of Sudbury, and Ex-mayor
of Cambridge.

TEWKESBURY.

Sir,

Cheltenham, December 1, 1874.

I have the honour to forward replies to the inquiries of Mr. Secretary Cross.

1. In my opinion, Yes; but the fault is, that the punishment is not awarded with sufficient stringency.

2. Brutal assaults of husbands on wives and on women and children.

3. I see no reason for extension.

4. I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised in cases of brutal assaults on women and children, but only to follow the verdict of a jury.

5. In my opinion it has,

I have, &c.

JAMES FALLON,
Recorder of Tewkesbury.

TIVERTON.

December 2, 1874.

1. Assaults being divided into, 1, unlawfully and maliciously wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm, &c., punishable with penal servitude for life. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 18.

2. Unlawfully and maliciously wounding or inflicting grievous bodily harm (without the intent) punishable with seven years penal servitude or two years imprisonment. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 20.

3. Assaults occasioning actual bodily harm punishable as No. 2. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47.

4. Common assault indictment, one year's imprisonment. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47.

5. Common assault to be tried before two justices, two months, fine not exceeding 5*l*. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 42.

6. Aggravated assaults, six months, fine 20*l*. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43.

It is difficult to say that the penal law is not stringent and its want of success in repressing brutality must arise from its provisions being badly administered. In indictments, counts are generally inserted to enable juries to convict of the lesser offence, and their compassion constantly makes them find their verdict for the lesser offence, and even for a common assault when the most brutal assaults have been proved to have been committed.

If there were no distinction in punishment between classes No. 1 and No. 2 a judge would often be able to, practically, set right a mistaken verdict.

1. The sentence of imprisonment for common assaults should be extended to two years.

2. It might be advantageous to have all aggravated assaults tried by indictment, *i.e.* these assaults coming under class 6, or if the jurisdiction of justices is to be retained, the punishment shall be imprisonment without option of fine.

3. The fine and term of imprisonment for common assault should be increased to 10*l*. and six months.

4. I am for flogging in every case of aggravated or more serious assault, and a short term of imprisonment, accompanied by two floggings, would be a better punishment than a long term of imprisonment, during which the wife and family of the culprit are reduced to want or to seek support from the parish.

There is a sentimental argument against flogging which has some weight, namely, that the feelings of degradation would cause the criminal to be more vindictive than ever against his victim, but still against that should be set the certainty, that the suffering physical pain of a kind somewhat similar to that which has been caused to the victim would make him less liable to err a second time if he thought of it.

HENRY CLARK,
Recorder of Tiverton.

WALSALL.

1, Elm Court, Temple, London,
Wednesday, December 1, 1874.

Sir,

I beg to thank you for the honour of your circular of the 15th of last October, to which I have given much and repeated consideration.

In answer to question No. 1, I am of opinion that "the penal law against assaults of "brutal violence," is not sufficient, and that it should be amended by adding the punishment of flogging under the same restrictions as those enacted by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. Provided always, that no flogging shall be inflicted except after conviction by a verdict of a jury.

In answer to question No. 2, I am of opinion that in every case of assault, the presiding magistrate should have power to refer the case for trial by jury.

In answer to question No. 3, I am of opinion that the maximum of fine or imprisonment before courts of summary jurisdiction, ought not to be extended.

In answer to question No. 4, I am of opinion that in every case of assault, proved before a jury, the court should possess the option of awarding the punishment of flogging under proper restrictions, as provided by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., but where the punishment of flogging is given, no longer term of imprisonment should be permitted for the same offence, beyond the time necessary to carry out with safety to health the number of floggings ordered.

In answer to question No. 5, I am of opinion that flogging has been most efficacious in putting down the offences at which it was aimed by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.; but I am further of opinion, that such Act, in allowing as many as 50 strokes to be given to convicts above 16 years old, has gone to the full stretch of what is desirable, while, by restricting to the birch all offenders under 16 years the Act falls short. Having myself seen much corporal punishment inflicted during some years of my early life, when I served in the royal navy, I am of opinion that it would be better to limit the number of lashes to 36 for convicts above 18 years old, 25 lashes for convicts between the ages of 14 and 18, and to order these young convicts to be punished with only a "boy's cat," a term given in the navy to whips or "cats" possessing only five tails, instead of

the full number of nine tails. As the birch possesses little power beyond its name, it should be restricted to boys of 14 at the oldest. In every case the floggings should be as severe with regard to the weapon as health will permit; but the strokes or lashes should be few in number, and repeated, if necessary, at frequent intervals. The good effects of flogging are produced less by the actual pain inflicted than by the mental dread between the punishments, which seems to possess special powers over brutal and uneducated natures.

Finally, I am of opinion that a reform of almost incalculable benefit would be effected on the criminal law, by giving a general option to all courts of record, after verdict by jury, to substitute flogging for penal servitude, but at the same time carefully forbidding both punishments to be combined against the same convict, unless at long intervals of time and for distinct offences. At present the rates and taxes are burdened to punish convicts who often prefer, as well they may, the comforts of a prison to the cares, toils, and anxieties of labour in freedom, thus innocent taxpayers are punished for guilty convicts to be clothed and fed. Recorders are constantly urged by borough magistrates to give penal servitude in lieu of imprisonments, in order to shift on the Consolidated Fund the costs of maintaining prisoners, which otherwise fall on the borough funds. Were flogging permitted in lieu of penal servitude, under proper instructions, I am of opinion, that all our gaols would soon be comparatively empty, and that we should abolish altogether the most dangerous classes of thieves who now educate and harden one another in penal servitude. A man who has once been in penal servitude has, under the present system, scarcely any alternative but to live by crime. Every one is afraid to employ him, the door of hope or of repentance is almost shut against him. But if a convict were only severely flogged, this would in no way damage his future career further than a simple conviction would damage him. In the navy, flogging has never been found to damage the character or loyalty or disposition of the men in any way; though some of the very best seamen will occasionally get drunk at sea, and always must be flogged for it. No remedy known to man has ever been found to stop drunkenness, but flogging. In my opinion, therefore, it may be safely relied on to reduce crime to its lowest possible limit, and to effect a public saving of nearly half a million a year, besides doubling the security of life and property.

At your request, but with the utmost deference and humility of judgment, I beg to submit to you these views, for which I shall be happy at any time to render my full reasons.

I have, &c.

W. J. NELSON NEALE,
Recorder of Walsall.

WARWICK.

Sir, 2, Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, November 12th, 1874.

I beg to return the following answers to the questions submitted to me by the accompanying letter from you of the 15th of October:—

1. I think the penal law is sufficiently stringent. The maximum punishment now is five years penal servitude or two years' imprisonment with hard labour; and I cannot but think that the evil has arisen from the courts of assize and quarter sessions having failed in cases of brutal violence to give the maximum punishment, and from magistrates at petty sessions having taken upon themselves in many instances to treat bad cases as common assaults and so to bring them within their jurisdiction.

2. I think every assault excessive in degree should be tried at assizes or quarter sessions (I am not speaking of aggravated assaults upon females or boys under 14 years of age, which I think may be safely left where they are), and that magistrates should be compelled to send them for trial there, where there can be no reasonable doubt that the assaults are beyond common assaults and involve circumstances of aggravation.

3. I do not think this desirable, I would rather see courts of summary jurisdiction impose their maximum fine or maximum term of imprisonment.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for violent assaults on women and children, but I would have it ordered only by courts of assize or quarter sessions.

5. I have not seen returns, but I have no doubt that the offences for which flogging is authorised by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. have materially diminished since the passing of that Act.

I am, &c.

W. C. BEASLEY,
Recorder of Warwick.

WENLOCK.

3, Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, E.C.,
December 1, 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your circular note of the 15th of October last addressed to me and others engaged in the administration of justice, and requesting, on behalf of Mr. Secretary Cross, my observations and opinions upon the points raised by five questions, I have the honour to submit, for the consideration of Mr. Secretary Cross, my views upon those points as follows:—

1. By "assaults of brutal violence," I understand (*a.*) assaults committed with violence or in numbers accompanied by intent to rob, now punishable on indictment by penal servitude for five years, or imprisonment for two years with hard labour, and with flogging (24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. s. 43, 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44). (*b.*) Similar assaults committed by means of strangling, or producing insensibility accompanied by an intent to commit either any felony or any misdemeanor, punishable with penal servitude for life, or imprisonment for two years with hard labour, and with flogging (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 21, 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44). (*c.*) Incurable rogues violently resisting their apprehension by constable under the Vagrant Act, and, afterwards convicted, punishable by one year's imprisonment and flogging, by order of quarter sessions only (5 Geo. 4. c. 83). (*d.*) Assaults committed in the perpetration of any felony after a previous conviction for felony, punishable by penal servitude for life or imprisonment for four years, or in case of males, one, two, or three floggings, public or private (7 & 8 Geo. 4. c. 28. s. 11). (*e.*) Assaults occasioning actually bodily harm, or inflicting grievous bodily harm, punishable on indictment by penal servitude for five years or imprisonment for two years, with hard labour (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 20, 47). And I answer the first question by saying that, subject to my answer to question No. 4, the penal law against such assaults is sufficiently stringent.

2. I think not.

3. I am inclined to think that in order to meet cases of common assaults by which pain and suffering have been caused, but the effect on the person is of an evanescent character, such as black eyes, discolourations of skin, injuries to the private parts, &c., and not inflicting such permanent injuries as amount to actual bodily harm, or to aggravated assault in the technical sense of the term, the maximum term of imprisonment for common assaults may be extended from two months to six months with or without hard labour.

4. Assuming it to be expedient that flogging should be retained as a punishment, I think the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. may advantageously be extended to cases where an assault occasioning actual bodily harm or severe pain and bodily suffering, not amounting to a permanent disfigurement of the person, has been inflicted by two or more persons on one, or by one with a weapon upon one without, or where any one adopts the means mentioned in the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 21. to resist his apprehension by a constable, and where an assault is committed by means of gouging, or injuries to the private parts, and such like, so also with respect to aggravated assaults on women and children, if males, under the age of 14 years. All the offences but the last should, undoubtedly, only be so punishable on indictment, but with respect to the last I believe it to be the result of experience that the result of a committal and trial on indictment frequently proves abortive, on account of the relationship which very frequently exists between the prisoner and his victim, and the consequent unwillingness to give evidence or press home the charge, as well as the passing away of the effects of the violence, and often the greater punishment inflicted on the victim than on the prisoner by a conviction and subsequent imprisonment. I am, nevertheless, decidedly opposed to placing the power of the punishment of flogging in the hands of justices exercising a summary jurisdiction. Local prejudice would often mislead them, an ill effect on the administration of justice would be produced by a justice, also an employer of labour, inflicting such a punishment on a workman with whom he may at any time have had a dispute. Clergymen who are justices would not, I think, exercise this power judiciously. I would then suggest a procedure by the application of the provisions of the Vagrant Act (5 Geo. 4. c. 83. ss. 5-10). I would therefore allow the justices still summarily to convict the offender, but if they deem the case a proper one for the infliction of flogging they might, instead of passing sentence, commit the offender to prison until the next quarter sessions, to be kept to hard labour in the meantime, and such quarter sessions should have power to examine into the circumstances of the case and order, if they think fit, the offender to be further imprisoned for one year with hard labour, and to be flogged, publicly or privately. The conviction and deposition should be transmitted to the sessions, and the witnesses bound over to appear and give evidence.

The offender would not in such case be indicted, but the sentence would be passed in open court before a full bench and in the presence of the bar.

5. The offences referred have undoubtedly very much diminished, but I do not attribute that effect to any great extent to the punishment of flogging. I think the determined attitude taken up by society generally, and the means generally adopted for the individual defence, as well as the generally severe sentences of penal servitude passed by the judges (though perhaps in some cases aided by the flogging), were the more efficient causes of putting down the offences. The venture was no longer worth the risk. I doubt also whether flogging produces any material effect except in the case of mere cowards. If the man of brutal nature possesses also animal courage I think flogging does not possess any great terror. The frequency of its infliction diminishes its effect when inflicted, and I think it can hardly be doubted that each administration tends to brutalize all those who are concerned, whether as actors or spectators, voluntary or involuntary.

With this expression of my views,

I have, &c.

T. S. PRITCHARD,

Recorder of Wenlock.

WIGAN.

Sir,

Preston, November 12, 1874.

In reply to the circular letter of Mr. Secretary Cross, dated the 15th ulto., requesting me to furnish him with my observations and opinions on the points therein mentioned, I beg to say as follows:—

1 and 2. I have reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, it is now sufficiently stringent. I say "reluctantly" because the law as it now is would, I think, have been sufficiently stringent if it had been firmly and judiciously administered during the last few years.

Justices sitting in petty sessions have had power in ordinary assault cases to inflict fines to the amount of 5*l.*, and in default of payment to imprison for two months with hard labour, and, in aggravated assaults upon females and boys under 16 years, to inflict fines not exceeding 20*l.*, and in default of payment to imprison with hard labour for six months, and to bind over the offender to keep the peace for six months longer.

The reports of proceedings before justices in the northern counties and boroughs when sitting in petty sessions show, in my opinion, that these powers have been generally ineffectually exercised. The fines imposed have been 5*s.*, 10*s.*, and occasionally 20*s.*, but rarely more, and the imprisonments in default of payment (until very recently) were for 7 or 14 days, and in a few cases only for a month.

Many of these cases, treated as trifling assaults, have been of so violent and brutal a nature that the perpetrators of them ought to have been committed for trial at quarter sessions. This misplaced leniency has been an encouragement to the perpetration of the outrages in question, an incitement to contempt for the law and its administration, a deterrent to police officers from the proper and energetic performance of their onerous, responsible, and often dangerous duties, and a source of anxiety to peaceful and respectable persons who know that if assaulted by a band of ruffians, the police often dare not interfere for their protection, as any injuries the police might incur, even dangerous ones, would probably be visited only with a nominal punishment.

Another consequence of this leniency has been that many of the best men for a police force will not join, and others who have joined have very soon left, sacrificing their wages on discovering or believing that they could not expect proper protection. On this latter point you will find my opinion confirmed by the last report of Captain Elgee, the Inspector-General of the Constabulary of Northern Counties, in his remarks on the police force of Wigan, a confirmation I am glad to receive, as on more than one occasion I have thought it my duty to mention the subject in my address to the grand jury of that borough.

I would suggest that the law be amended by an enactment that all assaults of brutal violence, should be liable only at assizes or quarter sessions, and that such courts should have power, in addition to any imprisonment, to order any male over 16 to be flogged with such instrument as the Government and Parliament should approve of.

To carry out the above suggestion, however, it would be desirable and almost necessary to give some definition of the words "assaults of brutal violence." This seems to

me to be a question for the Home Secretary and Parliament to solve. But I would include in that category, all cases in which the knife had been used, or where male or female had been kicked so as to cause serious injury, more especially with clogs, or thick boots or shoes, and whether tipped with iron or other metal, or not; and unprovoked assaults of all kinds, occasioning such bodily harm as to prevent the victim from following his or her occupation for (say) three days, with power for the court in all cases to order the offender to make some pecuniary compensation for the injuries received for the loss of wages, and the expenses of medical and other attendance.

3. I am of opinion that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should not be extended.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., not only especially in cases of assaults on women and children, but for other kinds of violence which I have intimated above.

5. I am not able to answer this question of my own knowledge, but, from opinions expressed by different judges of assize, from the criminal statistics, and from general belief, I am of opinion that flogging has been efficacious, in putting down, or rather greatly diminishing, the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I am, &c.

JOSEPH CATTERALL,
Recorder of Wigan.

WINDSOR.

Sir, Lincoln's Inn, October 31, 1874.

In reply to the questions proposed on the other side, I may say—

A strong impression was made on my mind when I was at Eton, that epitome of the world (where cruel selfish boys, without disguise, made manifest their characteristic savagery in the form of bullying smaller boys), that the cruel were generally cowards, and afraid of the physical pain they inflicted with pleasure on others; when an honest big boy assumed the duty of protector and proposed to thrash them as they deserved, and that the conduct of the bullies was much controlled by the apprehension of such infliction.

I have been confirmed by subsequent experience in the opinion that flogging would increase the corrective effect of punishments in offences of violence, and that the knowledge of the liability would exercise a restraining effect.

Many criminals while committing these offences estimate the consequences by such sayings as this, I will stand three months or six according to the punishments most recently brought to their notice. I therefore recommend that stipendiary magistrates should have given to them the power to add flogging to the sentences, such flogging to be promptly inflicted in summary cases, and that a similar power be granted to other tribunals in addition to those they now exercise.

I have, &c.

A. M. SKINNER,
Recorder of Windsor.

WOLVERHAMPTON.

Sir, 9, King's Bench Walk, Temple, December 22, 1874.

I regret that in consequence of my absence from London through ill-health, I have not been able to send you an earlier reply to the questions which you have addressed to me, on behalf of Mr. Secretary Cross, respecting the more effectual repression of crimes of violence. I now send the following replies to them:—

1. I think the penal law against assaults of brutal violence sufficiently stringent. I presume that "brutal violence" must occasion "actual bodily harm," and a man convicted of such an assault may now be sentenced (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 47, and 27 & 28 Vict. c. 47. s. 2) to five years penal servitude. If the assault be of such a character that this would be an insufficient punishment, it would in all probability be such, that the evidence respecting it would support an indictment for assault with intent to kill or maim; or some other intent, in respect of which the law apports still heavier punishment. In my judgment what is wanted is not so much an extension of the

stringency of the penal law, as that the law as it exists should be put in effective operation.

2. I think not.

3. I think not. Such cases should be referred by the magistrates to the sessions or the assizes.

4. I think not. I very much doubt the efficacy of flogging or indeed of other punishments (though of course they are necessary) in the repression of crime. A man about to commit a crime does not generally, in my opinion, think of the punishment attending it. He calculates upon escaping punishment altogether, if he thinks of it at all. Attacks on women and children are generally the result of sudden passion, and are often committed under the influence of drink, and when either from passion or drink the man is incapable of considering the punishment he may incur. In proportion as this is true is the inefficacy of punishment; and I think unless proved to be very efficacious, punishment such as flogging should not be inflicted, since it tends not only to brutalize the recipient, but also to degrade the character of the nation in which it is inflicted.

5. My impression is that it has not, but the returns which I understand are to be made will enlighten us on the subject. I would remark that it was formerly thought that flogging was necessary to maintain discipline in the army and navy. It has now been practically, or at all events, to a very great extent, discontinued, yet I believe it will be found that the discipline in the army and navy is at least as good now as it ever was. So flogging was formerly inflicted for many minor offences, such as petty larceny, vagrancy, &c.; women also were commonly flogged, and yet I do not think, taking all things into consideration, that it will be found such minor offences, or the number of female offenders, has increased since flogging has been abolished in respect of them. In my judgment, in these cases, as in other matters, prevention is better than cure, and proper care for the moral and industrial education of the poorer classes, as well as for their mental education, will in the course of a generation tend far more to the diminution of crime than any kind or degree of punishment.

JOHN J. POWELL,

Recorder of Wolverhampton.

WORCESTER.

Sir,

3, Dr. Johnson's Buildings, Temple, November 25, 1874.

In reply to your letter dated 15th October 1874, in which you state that Mr. Secretary Cross is desirous of ascertaining the views of myself and others engaged in the administration of justice on the points raised by the five questions therein asked, I beg to inform you for the Secretary of State's information:—

1. That I think the penal law in cases of assault, not of a trifling or indecent character, is not sufficiently deterrent, and should be amended by an enactment as follows:—

“Whosoever shall unlawfully and wilfully violent assault, beat, or ill-treat any person, thereby occasioning such person bodily injury or suffering, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof, shall, at the discretion of the court, be kept in penal servitude for five years, or be imprisoned with or without hard labour, for any period not exceeding two years, or, if a male, shall be imprisoned with hard labour for any period not exceeding one year, and be once privately flogged. And the expression ‘flogged’ shall mean a punishment to be inflicted by strokes on the back, not exceeding 30, and with an instrument to be named, together with the number of strokes in the sentence.”

2. Yes; I think all unlawful and wilful assaults of a violent character, and all indecent assaults should be declared triable only at assizes or quarter sessions.

Magistrates in my opinion too often treat assaults in a way quite ineffectual for the protection of the public from insult and injury. Indecent assaults I consider require public investigation before a jury. Moreover, justices are too apt to deal with cases of a serious kind, such as attempts to rape, as indecent assaults.

3. Certainly not, and I believe many magistrates would themselves object to any such extension of their jurisdiction.

4. Yes; in cases of violent assaults on women and children, I think the punishment of flogging should be enacted, and I suggest the following enactment:—

“Whosoever shall unlawfully and wilfully violently assault, beat, or ill-treat any woman or child, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof, shall be imprisoned with or without hard labour, for any period not exceeding 12 months, and

“ if a male, shall be once privately flogged. And the expression ‘woman’ shall mean any female person of the age of 16 years, and the expression ‘child’ shall mean any person under the age of 16 years. And the expression ‘flogged’ shall have the same meaning, and be inflicted in the same manner, and be specified in the sentence as in the foregoing enactment.”

5. I answer this question in the affirmative, but I consider the punishment too unfrequently inflicted.

I have, &c.

FRANCIS TOWERS STREETEN,
Recorder of Worcester.

GREAT YARMOUTH.

Sir,

Norwich, November 6, 1874.

I have the honour to submit the following answers to your five questions relating to the more effectual repression of crimes of violence :—

1. In my opinion the law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent. The court at assizes or quarter assizes should be empowered to order a person, being a male, convicted of an assault of brutal violence to be flogged, as provided by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

2. Assaults of brutal violence, including brutal assaults by husbands on wives, should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. The amount of fine imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction may be increased to a maximum of 20*l.*, but in my opinion no person should be imprisoned for a longer term than six months, unless convicted by a jury, and therefore that the term of imprisonment by courts of summary jurisdiction should not be extended.

4. Flogging should be authorised at the discretion of the court in cases of brutal assaults other than for offences within the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., especially in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. I believe that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

Sir, I beg most respectfully to express my earnest conviction that sending children to prison is attended with injurious results, and that it is desirable to empower the court or justices in dealing with persons, being males and under 16 years of age, where the offence is proved, and now punishable by fine or imprisonment, in lieu of such punishment to direct that the convicted boy be whipped with a birch rod, and to receive a certain number of strokes, not exceeding 20.

I have, &c.

SIMMS REEVE.

From Stipendiary Magistrates.

BIRKENHEAD.

Police Court, Hamilton Street, Birkenhead,
November 3, 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your circular of October 15, in which several questions are submitted relating to the punishment of offenders for assaults, I beg to say with regard to the 1st question, that in my opinion the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent. I would give power to courts of assize and courts of quarter sessions to order the infliction of corporal punishment, and I would also give magistrates in petty sessions the same power, under certain restrictions, for aggravated assaults on women and children.

I am also of opinion that it would be advisable to give magistrates power to punish more severely than they now can, persons summarily convicted of assaults upon men. For various reasons it is often desirable that such cases should be decided at once (delay often giving immunity to offenders), and the punishment of two months imprisonment, which is the utmost that can now be given in such cases, is frequently inadequate to the offence. I would suggest that the power justices now have under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43. of punishing persons committing assaults on women and children by a penalty of 20*l.* or six months imprisonment, be extended to the cases of assaults upon men.

With regard to question 2—

I know of no kinds of assaults now punishable summarily which should be triable only at assizes or quarter sessions.

With regard to question 3—

I think the maximum fine and term of imprisonment which may now be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction are sufficient in cases of assaults on women and children; but as I have said in my answer to the 1st question, I would extend them in cases of assaults upon men.

With regard to the 4th question—

I am of opinion that for brutal assaults flogging should be authorised.

And with regard to question 5—

I am strongly of opinion that the punishment of the lash has been the means of putting down robberies with violence.

I have, &c.

CHAS. JN. PRESTON,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

BIRMINGHAM.

Sir,

Police Court, Birmingham, Oct. 29, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of October 17, in reference to the punishment of persons guilty of assaults, and I beg leave to submit the following answers to the several queries proposed by you:—

1. I do not think the existing penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, sufficiently stringent. I will state, in the course of my replies to the other queries, in what manner I think it might well be altered.

2. It does not occur to me that there are any kinds of assaults now punishable summarily, which ought, as a class, to be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

I think there must necessarily be a discretion left to the magistrates in determining whether to deal summarily with any case of assault, or to commit for trial. It seems impossible to define exactly the degree of violence which should make it imperative to commit a prisoner for trial.

3. I do not think it is desirable that the maximum fine or term of imprisonment which may be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended. I think it better that cases requiring a greater amount of punishment than that which they now possess should be remitted to the assizes.

I would, however, offer a suggestion in respect of the age of the offender. At present the age of fourteen years is the limit at which corporal punishment can be inflicted by a court of summary jurisdiction. Many magistrates are of opinion that this should be extended to sixteen years.

In general I do not think it expedient that this extension should take place. A youth of sixteen is too old to be whipped for ordinary offences. But in the case of an aggravated assault on a female, or an assault, in company with one or two others, on a peace officer in the execution of his duty, or extreme cruelty to an animal, I think magistrates might be entrusted with the power of inflicting corporal punishment up to the age of sixteen years.

I would, however, suggest that in such cases the sentence of whipping should be delayed at least till the next day.

It may sometimes be inconvenient, when petty sessions are held only once a week or once a fortnight, for the same magistrates to attend on a second day, but where the case is of sufficient importance to justify whipping, I think they would almost always be willing to submit to the inconvenience, and make a special session for the purpose.

4. I do not think it would be expedient at present to extend largely the power of flogging adults. There is certainly a loud demand for such an extension, but I fear this power would not always be exercised wisely, and that a reaction would ensue which would lead to the abandonment of corporal punishment altogether.

I think it should be reserved for cases of great atrocity, and exercised only on a conviction at the assizes.

In my opinion it might be allowed in the following cases:—

- (a.) An assault, occasioning bodily harm, on a peace officer in the execution of his duty, by more than two persons in company.
- (b.) An aggravated assault on a female by a person who has within two years been convicted of an assault on a female, and punished by a fine of 5*l.*, or any imprisonment without the option of a fine; or who has been within the same period twice convicted of any assault on a female.
- (c.) An assault with intent, &c. upon any girl under fourteen years of age.

As connected with this subject I would suggest that, in case of criminal assaults on girls, the ages of twelve and fourteen in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 50, 51, 52, should be substituted for 10 and 12 respectively.

5. I entertain no doubt whatever that flogging has been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., and I am convinced that if extended to the offences which I have specified above, it would very seldom be necessary to resort to it. The men who commit these offences are almost always brutal cowards, and their fear of severe bodily pain would, I believe, deter them from encountering the risk of it.

We have in our borough gaol at this time more than 100 men suffering imprisonment for acts of violence; many of them for terms of six and nine months, for assaults on women and peace officers.

If some of the worst cases had, on the first breaking out of the epidemic of brutality among us, some months since, been committed to the assizes with the knowledge that the judge would have the power of ordering them to be flogged, in addition to a term of imprisonment, I firmly believe the number of prisoners would not have reached half the present amount. I conceive that the want of this power has done much more to brutalize our population than the infliction of two or three floggings would have done.

I have in my reply to your former circular advocated the extension of the provisions of the "Juvenile Offenders Act" to all offences committed by boys and girls under 16 years of age, except such as can only be tried at the assizes.

This would of course allow the punishment of whipping boys in many cases to which it cannot now be applied,—*e.g.*, garden robbing, injuries to property, &c., but only to 14 years of age.

I have, &c.

T. C. SNEYD-KYNNERSLEY.

BRIGHTON.

Sir, Police Court, Town Hall, Brighton, November 13, 1874.

In answer to the questions in your letter of the 15th October, I think,—

1st. That the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent, and that the court of assize or quarter sessions should have power to order flogging in such cases.

2nd. No.

3rd. No, if there are circumstances which require a higher punishment than the court can impose, it is better it should go before a jury.

4th. Any court of assize or quarter sessions should have power to flog in cases of assaults on women and children, and brutal assaults on men.

5th. I have had no experience enabling me to answer this question.

I am, &c.

ARTHUR BIGGE,
Police Magistrate, Brighton.

CARDIFF.

Sir, Cardiff, October 30, 1874.

In reply to the questions put in your circular of the 15th instant with regard to measures for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence, I beg to say,—

1. That I think the law against assaults of brutal violence should be made more stringent by authorising flogging.

2. I do not know of any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I think it desirable that the maximum fine for assaults on men should be increased for a first offence to 20*l.*, and the imprisonment to six months, and on a subsequent conviction to, say 30*l.* and nine months.

4. I think it desirable to authorise flogging in all cases of assaults on women and children, and in cases of assaults on men where weapons are used.

5. My experience does not enable me to say whether flogging has been successful as a punishment under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

R. O. JONES,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

LEEDS.

Sir, Police Court, Leeds, November 11, 1874.

In answer to the circular of the 15th October last, I have the honour to submit the following observations and opinions:—

1, I am of opinion that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, is not sufficiently stringent. I think, however, that it requires very little alteration to make it sufficiently stringent; and that even as the law at present stands, if judges and magistrates had the same horror of brutal assaults that they have of petty larcenies they would speedily diminish the number of such assaults by inflicting in cases brought before them the maximum amount of punishment which they are now empowered to award.

I think the penal law against assaults of brutal violence should be amended by extending the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. (which authorises whipping in certain cases) to convictions of crimes under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 18 and 20. This amendment would enable courts of gaol delivery and of quarter sessions to order the punishment of whipping (in addition to the punishments which those courts may now award), not only in cases where the assault had been committed with any of the intents mentioned in s. 18., but also in cases where the jury did not convict of the intents mentioned in

s. 18., but merely of an unlawful and malicious wounding, or inflicting grievous bodily harm with or without weapon or instrument (s. 20). Juries so frequently negative the intents mentioned in s. 18., and convict under s. 20., that unless the lash was authorised on convictions under s. 20., many most brutal and dangerous assaults would escape this punishment.

2. I am of opinion that there are not any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions. I think the magistrates before whom a case is brought ought to be left to exercise their own discretion (within its present limits) as to whether such case ought to be dealt with summarily or remitted to assizes or quarter sessions. Some cases, especially those of wife beaters, if not summarily dealt with, would often entirely escape punishment. Some time ago I was sent for at midnight to take the deposition of a woman who was supposed to be dying from kicks and blows inflicted an hour or two before by her husband. The woman, however, recovered, and I, thinking the assault was one which would not be adequately punished by six months imprisonment, under s. 43 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. committed the husband for trial under s. 20 of that statute. The grand jury, however, threw out the bill, the wife either not appearing before them, or, if she did appear before them, making excuses for her husband. Encouraged by his escape, the husband, not many months after, again severely beat his wife, and in consequence again appeared before me. On that occasion I sentenced him to six months imprisonment.

3. I am of opinion that on a summary conviction for assault under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 42. the maximum fine should be increased from 5*l.* to 10*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment from two months to three months, and that the justices should further be empowered to bind over the defendant, with or without sureties, to keep the peace and be of good behaviour for a period not exceeding six months from the payment of the fine or the expiration of the imprisonment. I am further of opinion that on a summary conviction for assault under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43. (aggravated assaults on children not exceeding 14 years of age, and on women) the justices should be empowered, in addition to fining or imprisoning the offender, as in that section mentioned, to bind him over, with or without sureties, to keep the peace and be of good behaviour for a period not exceeding six months from the payment of the fine or the expiration of the imprisonment. The better opinion seems to be that under s. 43. as it at present stands the justices can only require the defendant to enter into his own recognizances. I am also of opinion that when a person convicted under s. 43. has been previously convicted under the same section within two years, the maximum term of imprisonment on such second conviction should be nine months, as in the case of summary convictions of assaults on the police in the execution of their duty. See 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112. s. 12.

It will be seen that I do not propose to increase the maximum fine or imprisonment for assaults under s. 43. on a first conviction. My reason for this is that I have found an imprisonment of six months a very substantial deterrent to the ordinary rough. Serious assaults upon the police at Leeds are now very rare, and I attribute this very much to the fact that very shortly after the Habitual Criminals Act came into operation I passed several sentences of six calendar months imprisonment for such assaults. To a professional thief a sentence of six months imprisonment is a small matter; he is accustomed to gaol, and knows how to make the best of his surroundings there; but it is a very different matter with the rough, whose power of adapting himself to prison life is small, and who finds its confinement, monotony, and enforced abstinence a very substantial punishment.

4. I think flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. The cases in which I would authorise it appear from my answer to question 1. I think if the summary jurisdiction of justices over assaults was amended as indicated in my answer to question 3, and the power of awarding flogging in certain cases given to assizes and quarter sessions, as indicated in my answer to question 1, and the powers thus conferred were faithfully exercised, there would be a great diminution in the number of assaults of brutal violence.

5. I am of opinion that flogging has been efficacious in very much diminishing the number of offences for which it is authorised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

In conclusion I may add, what is perhaps sufficiently evident from what I have already said, that I do not recommend that justices in petty sessions should have the power of awarding flogging as a punishment for assaults. One or two instances of mistaken convictions or undue severity on their part, and they could hardly be avoided among so large and miscellaneous a body, would create a revulsion of public feeling against the use

of the lash altogether, and discredit a mode of punishment which under due restrictions I think likely to be most beneficial in its effects.

I beg to submit the above observations and opinions on the subjects on which you have been pleased to request them from me.

And have, &c.

W. BRUCE,

Stipendiary Magistrate for
the Borough of Leeds.

LIVERPOOL.

Borough Magistrates Office, Dale Street, Liverpool,

October 26, 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your circular of the 15th instant, I will answer categorically the queries of Mr. Secretary Cross, and beg to refer to my communication of the 14th ult., in reply to the previous circular of Mr. Liddell.

(1.) I think that the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is sufficiently stringent, with one reservation, viz., that there are certain cases of excessive brutal violence which present every feature of cases of murder, except that the victim survives, perhaps in a maimed or mangled state, which will continue for the remainder of life, and for such crimes I think there ought to be power to inflict the extreme penalty.

(2.) I answer in the negative, but remark that although my own practice has for years been to send for trial at the assizes or sessions, when I could ensure the attendance of the witnesses, all assaults in which the knife or other sharp instrument has been used, and a wound, however slight, has been caused thereby; or in which actual bodily harm has been inflicted without a wound; yet that such cases are frequently and improperly dealt with summarily as common assaults, and the utmost penalty is at present the very inadequate punishment of a fine of 5*l.* or two months imprisonment. Therefore,

(3.) I think it desirable that the provisions in regard to aggravated assaults on women and children under 14 years of age (see 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43.) should be extended so as to include assaults on every person, male or female.

(4.) I think that flogging should be authorised for all crimes of brutal violence, but only after trial by a jury at assizes or quarter sessions.

(5.) It is the general opinion that flogging has been efficacious in decreasing the offences for which it is now authorised.

I am, &c.

T. S. RAFFLES,

Police Magistrate.

MANCHESTER.

Sir,

City Police Court, Manchester, November 16, 1874.

I have the honour to enclose you my answers to the questions contained in your circular of the 15th ult., respecting the more effectual repression of crimes of violence. I also enclose a return of the number of prisoners charged with assault and dealt with summarily by the magistrates for the last five years, as well as a return of the prisoners sent to be tried at the sessions during the last 10 years. You will observe that the number of prisoners brought up for assaults during the last year only exceeds by three the number charged in 1870, but that there is a considerable increase in the number of persons sent to prison. Assault cases are more frequently tried before the borough justices than before myself, so I cannot exactly say whether this increase is caused by an increase in the number of brutal assaults or by the desire of the magistrates to try and put down this class of crime by increased severity of punishment. I do not think that I have had a greater number of brutal cases brought before me during the last year than in previous years.

I also enclose some suggestions for the amendment of the law relating to the summary jurisdiction of magistrates, which I must apologise for being so long in sending.

I am, &c.

FRANCIS J. HEADLAM.

MANCHESTER CONSTABULARY.

The Town Hall, Manchester, October 31, 1874.

RETURN of the NUMBER of PERSONS tried at the MANCHESTER SESSIONS on CHARGES of ASSAULT and inflicting BODILY HARM, ASSAULTS on POLICE, and ASSAULTS COMMON, for the last 10 Years; showing the result of the Proceedings.

Year ended 29th Sept.	OFFENCE.	Number of Persons tried.	Bills not found.	Acquitted.	5 Years and under 10 Years.	1 Year and under 5 Years.	6 Months and under 12 Months.	1 Month and under 6 Months.	Under 1 Month.	Fined, or to find Sureties.
1865	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	5	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	1
	" on police	5	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	—
	" common	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
1866	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
	" on police	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
	" common	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
1867	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—
	" on police	2	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—
	" common	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1868	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	5	—	—	1	—	1	3	—	—
	" on police	15	—	2	—	2	6	5	—	—
	" common	3	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	1
1869	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	9	—	1	—	3	2	3	—	—
	" on police	5	—	—	—	3	—	2	—	—
	" common	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
1870	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	7	—	—	1	—	—	4	2	—
	" on police	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	" common	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
1871	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	5	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	2
	" on police	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—
	" common	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—
1872	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	5	—	2	—	1	2	—	—	—
	" on police	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	" common	2	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—
1873	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	4	1	1	—	—	2	—	—	—
	" on police	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
	" common	2	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—
1874	Assault and inflicting bodily harm	10	—	2	2	1	3	2	—	—
	" on police	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	" common	5	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—

W. HENRY PALIN, Chief Constable.

RETURN of the Number of APPREHENSIONS for ASSAULTS and the RESULT of the PROCEEDINGS before the MAGISTRATES for the last Five Years.

Year ending 29th Sept.	Total Number of Apprehensions for Assaults.	Number discharged.	Number sent to Prison for			Number fined, to find Sureties, &c.
			Aggravated Assaults.	Assaults on Police.	Common Assaults.	
1870	2,792	900	44	34	144	1,670
1871	2,668	737	62	26	137	1,706
1872	2,605	776	50	56	138	1,585
1873	2,735	773	65	70	142	1,685
1874	2,795	713	79	84	180	1,739

1. I do not think that the law against assaults of brutal violence is sufficiently stringent in some particulars. I give my opinion as to how it may be amended in answer to questions 3 and 4.

2. I see no reason for taking away from courts of summary jurisdiction any powers they now hold over cases of assault.

3. I think the powers of courts of summary jurisdiction may advantageously be extended,—

(1.) In cases of common assault the power of imprisonment to be extended to three months and of fine to 10/.

(2.) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. s. 43. to apply to cases of aggravated assaults upon men as well as upon women and children. Power should be given to require the offenders to find sureties to keep the peace after the period of imprisonment, in addition to being bound themselves.

(3.) If there has been a previous conviction within two years, a power of imprisonment for nine months, as provided by the Prevention of Crimes Act, for assaults on the police.

(4.) Justices to have power to award compensation to the complainant either out of or in addition to the penalty.

4. The question of flogging is a very difficult one. I am on the whole in favour of adopting it in cases of brutal and unprovoked violence; but such punishment should not be awarded until after a trial before a jury. I do not, however, think that it would be advisable to extend this punishment to men charged with assaulting their wives, and as no doubt these are sometimes very bad, if not the worst cases of the kind, there may seem to be a difficulty in excepting them from the rule. I believe, however, that very few wives would themselves desire it, and they would shrink from appearing against their husbands if they thought there was any danger of the infliction of the lash; they are very averse even now to give evidence if they think that it will lead to much punishment, and that too when they still bear the marks of their husband's ill-usage. If a longer period had been allowed to elapse before the trial took place and the traces of violence had disappeared, and the sense of injury had subsided, they would probably either not appear at all or would modify their evidence so as to reduce it to nothing. Their chief desire always is to get what they term a "protection order," or to have their husbands bound over to keep the peace. I doubt also, if the lash were inflicted, whether they would ever cohabit together again. As these assaults are not generally premeditated, but committed under the influence of drink or sudden provocation, I do not think that the fear of flogging would act as a deterrent. On the whole, therefore, I am opposed to the punishment of flogging in these cases, but I would give the magistrates power to commit to prison for 12 months, with or without sureties, to keep the peace afterwards.

5. There has been a great decrease in the number of robberies with violence in Manchester during the last five years. According to the recent report of the chief constable, the number for the five years from September 1865 to September 1869 was 936. During the last five years the number was only 273, showing a reduction of more than 70 per cent. I see no reason to differ from the general opinion that the punishment of flogging has had a material effect in diminishing this class of crime.

FRANCIS J. HEADLAM,

Stipendiary Magistrate of Manchester.

MERTHYR TYDVIL.

Sir,

Merthyr Tydvil, Nov. 26, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a letter dated the 15th of October, containing certain questions as to what measures should be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

As the first question refers to assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults which may be dealt with under the summary jurisdiction of justices, on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, which can only be dealt with by indictment at the quarter sessions or assizes, I would answer the question in two ways:—

1st. With reference to offences of that description which are only triable at the assizes or quarter sessions.

2nd. With reference to questions as to other assaults which may be dealt with under the summary jurisdiction of justices.

1st. After a long experience in courts of assize and of quarter sessions, I would humbly submit as my opinion, that the punishment provided for wounding with intent, unlawful and malicious wounding, indecent and other assaults, occasioning actual bodily harm, is sufficiently stringent, subject to my answer to question No. 4.

My experience as a magistrate is, that the punishment which may be awarded under the summary jurisdiction of justices, for assaults on police constables and aggravated assaults upon women and children, viz., six months imprisonment, with hard labour, is quite sufficient to meet the justice of any case which magistrates ought to deal with, and if the assault is of so serious a character as to deserve, in the opinion of the magistrates, a greater punishment than that, it should, in my opinion, be sent for trial before a jury. But there are many assaults accompanied with great and brutal violence upon men, such as kicking and biting, which are often brought before justices, and for which the maximum term of imprisonment is two months with hard labour, a sentence which, in my humble opinion, is far too little to meet the requirements of many cases, and I would suggest that the term of imprisonment which magistrates should have the power to inflict in such cases, should not exceed six months with hard labour.

2nd. I do not think that there are any kinds of assault which may be now summarily punished which should be declared triable at assizes or quarter sessions only, and in my humble opinion, if the punishment for assaults accompanied with brutal violence were extended to six months imprisonment, as suggested in my last answer, a great many cases which are now sent for trial might, and would be, disposed of summarily, the tendency of juries being, in very many cases where the form of the indictment enables them to do so, to find a prisoner guilty of a common assault, and in cases where they do so the punishment seldom exceeds six months imprisonment.

3rd. This question, so far as the extension of the terms of imprisonment is concerned, is already answered in my answer to question No. 1., but I would suggest that the maximum fine in all cases of assault should be increased to 20*l.*, with power to the justices to order the payment of the whole or any portion of it to be made to the person injured, and that a provision should be made for injuries to the person similar to that contained in sect. 66 of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97., which applies to malicious injuries to property. In cases of assaults upon police constables in the execution of their duty, a fine not exceeding 20*l.* may be inflicted by the 34 & 35 Vict. c. 112. s. 12.

4th. I think that any court of assize or quarter sessions might well be authorised to sentence any person to be flogged who might be found guilty of any offence involving a cowardly and brutal assault, and I think such a punishment would have a most salutary effect in all cases of rape and indecent assaults upon young children; but I have great doubts whether magistrates should have the power to order the punishment of flogging, except in the case of juveniles, where the system has worked well.

5th. I have not sufficient knowledge on the matter to enable me to give an answer to this question.

I have, &c.

A. DE RUTYEN,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

3. Perhaps I may be allowed, in answer to question No. 3, to add a further reason for extending the amount of fine in cases of assault to 20*l.*, as it often happens that the result of an assault is the breaking of a person's leg, arm, or other bone, and where the act done, although wrongful, was never intended to cause the injury which really happened.

SHEERNESS.

Sir, Alexandra House, Sheerness, October 23, 1874.

I beg to enclose answers to the accompanying paper.

1. I can only answer this question by drawing a further and intermediate distinction in regard to the classification of assaults. I would divide thus:—

- a. Assaults involving brutal violence;
- [b. Assaults involving considerable violence];
- c. Trifling assaults.

Class (a.) appears to me to embrace absolutely such offences as are now indictable misdemeanors, viz., an unlawful wounding and an inflicting of grievous bodily harm.

I apprehend that the law is sufficient as it exists, and that such cases ought not to be dealt with summarily.

2. If I am right in the above contention, magistrates can only now deal with such cases of brutal violence by unwarrantably exceeding their jurisdiction. Such offences are only triable now on indictment.

3. I think it desirable that the term of imprisonment in cases of assault (which would include cases of considerable violence, see answer 1 (b.), as well as trifling assaults), should be extended to six months as under the 43rd section of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.

4. I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. I answer in the affirmative.

I have, &c.

FRANCIS EDW. GUISE.

SHEFFIELD.

Sir,

Sheffield, November 13, 1874.

After receiving your communication of the 15th of last month (asking me to send observations and opinion on the points referred to in the questions put for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, in his consideration of the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of crimes of violence), I have carefully considered the points raised, and have further asked the opinion of the rest of the magistrates for this town, and of others, such as Mr. Jackson, the chief constable. I now make answer to the questions asked, as follows:—

To Question 1.—It is, I believe, unanimously thought that the penal law should be amended by allowing a sentence of flogging to be given for assaults of brutal violence.

To Question 2.—I think that no kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished need be taken away from the summary jurisdiction of petty sessions, for the fact of the punishment following quick on the heels of the offence is of much value; and also witnesses are not willing to come forward in many cases if they have the prospect of an attendance at quarter sessions or assizes before them. Some dislike the trouble and expense, and some the greater publicity. I am, however, not in favour of allowing petty sessions to give sentences of flogging; but where a case appears to deserve such a sentence, I would have the petty sessions stay its hand from conviction and commit for trial at quarter sessions or assizes. I think that in the heat of the moment the person complaining is prone to make the most of the assault; thus, *e.g.*, after a series of unprovoked attacks which do no serious injury, A. pushes B. down, and B. falls on a feather bed; A. is perhaps fined. C. pushes D. down, and D. falls on the curbstone, then D. appears with an ugly wound, and is fully convinced that C. must have used extreme violence towards him, and shapes all his evidence with that impression on the mind. These, of course, are given as extreme cases, merely to show the kind of thing that has to be carefully watched by the magistrate who has these cases to deal with. I am, however, not supported in this view (of not giving the power to sentence to flogging to petty sessions) by all I have asked; some would have full power given to the petty sessions, and many would have a power given to order some smaller amount of strokes than quarter sessions or assizes.

To Question 3.—(1.) It is desirable that in addition to the fine or term of imprisonment which now may be imposed, a power should be given to order compensation (not exceeding 5*l.*) to be paid to the person assaulted if the case seems to entitle him or her to it, and that in default of payment of the compensation, a term of imprisonment may be ordered, with or without hard labour. Thus, in two cases, A. may be fined and ordered to compensate; B. may be imprisoned and ordered to compensate. If A. pays part only of the total amount he should be compelled to give priority to the compensation and costs over the fine; with B., costs should accompany the compensation order. The person assaulted should be allowed to decline having compensation ordered, without prejudice to a larger claim before another court. (2.) The maximum fine, when no compensation is ordered, might usefully be raised to 10*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment might usefully be extended to four months for common assaults, and for aggravated assaults to eight months. (3.) In addition to, and in lieu of other punishment, provision should be made for binding the offender to be of good behaviour and keep the peace for a term (say six months) after the expiration of the imprisonment, if any. I find that most people are in favour of this power being exerciseable with or without the offender having to find sureties in addition to his own recognizance. I am myself in favour of its being made without sureties only when imprisonment is given, for it seems to me that such an offender (especially in an aggravated case) is not very likely to find satisfactory sureties, and that instead of an indirect imprisonment after he has undergone the punishment for his offence it will be better to provide that if he breaks his own recognizance and does not pay the amount for which bound, and has no goods or chattels to levy the amount on, he should go to prison with hard labour for such part of the term he is bound for as may not have run out, in addition to a fresh punishment and a fresh binding over for the fresh offence which forfeits the recognizance. (A better and more summary way of estreating recognizances seems much needed, and provision wants making for the costs of so doing. People appear to attach little importance to the fact of having become surety; and I am also told that when the rare occurrence of an estreat has taken place, the clerk to the borough magistrates has of necessity paid the costs, though of course the results of the estreat are not received by him.) (4.) Indecent assaults on little children with or without attempt at connexion or the etc., and indecent behaviour to them wherever committed, and though without any assault, should be

punishable summarily. I have had to convict for assaults "in which there were circumstances of indecency," for to these cases the remarks in my answer to question 2 as to the witnesses, apply with special force.

To Question 4.—Yes, in cases of aggravated assaults of violence, whatever be the way in which the violence is exercised and whichever be the sex of the person assaulted.

To Question 5.—I cannot, of my own experience, speak much as to this, but Mr. Jackson, the chief constable of the borough, is of opinion that it certainly has.

I am, &c.

EDW. M. E. WELBY,
Police Magistrate and Justice of the Peace for
the Borough of Sheffield.

STAFFORDSHIRE POTTERIES.

We have further considered the questions contained in your letter of the 15th October 1874, and I append our reply to the same.

1. No. That in such cases power should be given to justices in their discretion, either to imprison up to 12 months or to imprison up to six months with the infliction of a limited number of strokes with the cat.

2. No.

3. The maximum term of imprisonment should be 12 months, and the maximum fine should be 20*l.* in all cases of assault.

4. Besides the power suggested to be given in answer No. 1, power should be given to judges of assize to order the cat in all cases of rape with violence and of assaults.

5. Yes.

SWANSEA.

Sir,

The Gnoll, Neath, Glamorganshire, November 6, 1874.

In answer to your questions dated the 15th of October, I have the honour to state with reference to question 1, that I think the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults and indecent assaults, is not sufficiently stringent. My experience as a stipendiary justice and a chairman of quarter sessions in a very populous county, leads me to the belief that imprisonment alone, though accompanied with hard labour, does not sufficiently restrain the violent and vindictive passions of uneducated men from breaking out into brutal cruelties. In illustration of this belief I may add that at our Michaelmas quarter sessions 1873, 13 persons were charged with acts of violence; we passed many apparently deterring and heavy sentences, and also at subsequent sessions, and yet last month no less than 18 persons were charged with crimes of violence. As a protection to the public and a probable antidote to this state of things, I submit that the power of ordering a limited number of lashes should be given to the judges of assize and the courts of quarter sessions in addition to the usual sentence for crimes of violence, but in no case except that of juveniles to justices in petty sessions. I am persuaded that the mere enactment of such a novel power would diminish this class of crime. But I also think that the lash ought to be very sparingly inflicted, because frequent floggings would inevitably create a reaction in the public mind, and evoke sympathy with criminals, and ultimately do more harm than good. I state my opinion in favour of such a power very reluctantly, and from a strong sense of the necessity of increasing the means of protection. As a rule I am averse to corporal punishment, and even in the reformatory school, of which I have been for many years the chairman, we almost dispense with it. But there seems to be a change in the temper of great numbers of the labouring classes which has greatly increased the risks of quiet persons in public houses and roads and streets. In the invaluable work called "Suggestions for the Repression of Crime," by the late Mr. Commissioner Hill, published in 1857, it is remarkable that there is scarcely an allusion to crimes of violence, which shows that theft, fraud, and robbery, not malicious injuries, were at that time the prevalent offences.

2. I think that aggravated assaults on women and children should be declared triable at assizes or quarter sessions, by which courts alone I conceive that flogging should be ordered.

3. I have found that the present maximum of two months imprisonment with hard labour or a fine of 20*l.* is sufficient for ordinary assaults, and is not often reached in practice.

4. In the answer to the first question I have submitted my reason for thinking that flogging should be authorised for crimes of violence triable at assizes and quarter sessions, especially in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. In this county we have no actual experience of the effect of flogging as a deterrent. It has never yet been inflicted here under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

JNO. COKE FOWLER,

Stipendiary Magistrate of Swansea and
Deputy Chairman of the Glamorganshire Sessions.

WORCESTER.

Sir,

Worcester, October 27, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, with the five questions as to the law of assaults with brutal violence, to be submitted to the opinion of magistrates.

In the district for which I act, containing about 33,000 inhabitants, I have found the present law on these assaults sufficient to meet the cases brought before me, but I feel diffident in expressing an opinion of this law in more populous places.

I have, &c.

CHAS. SIDEBOTTOM,

Police Magistrate.

From Magistrates of Metropolitan Police Courts.

MARLBOROUGH STREET.

Sir,

Police Court, Marlborough Street, November 3, 1874.

In reply to your letter of the 15th ultimo, with reference to Mr. Secretary Cross's desire for my opinions on certain questions therein referred to, I have the honour to state that with respect to—

No. 1. I think that the penal law is not sufficiently stringent against brutal assaults, and that flogging should be the additional punishment.

2. I am not aware of any kind of assaults which are now summarily punished which should be sent to assizes or sessions, with the exceptions of those which I mention in paragraph 4.

3. I am of opinion that the term of imprisonment for ordinary assaults, on summary conviction, should be extended to six months, that the fines should be extended to 20% at the least, and in the event of nonpayment, imprisonment with hard labour.

4. I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised for assaults on women and children, and policemen in the execution of their duty, but that in all cases where the magistrate is of opinion that flogging should be the punishment, the case should be sent before a jury, and that the depositions of the wife or child, taken before the magistrate, should be received in evidence in the event of the nonappearance of the witness at the trial, otherwise there might be a failure of justice.

5. I am not in a position to answer this question.

If I might be allowed to make a suggestion it would be this, with reference to wife beaters. It would unfetter the hands of justices in determining the sentence upon them if there was some certainty that the home of the man would not be "broken up," and the wife and children probably sent to the workhouse, from the want of support during his imprisonment. Here in London we have the funds of the poor box to fall back upon, but in the country there might be difficulties. I would therefore suggest that the hard labour done by the man during his term should in some manner be accounted for and applied to the relief of the family. The prison authorities might hand over to the relieving officer such sums as above mentioned, earned by the prisoner, and paid by him to the family weekly.

I have, &c.

R. TH. NEWTON.

Sir,

Police Court, Marlborough Street, October 24, 1874.

With reference to your circular of October 15, 1874, and as regards alterations of the law with regard to assaults, I would premise by saying that in my opinion assaults of brutal violence are much on the decrease in the Marlborough Street Court District. It would seem to follow that, as far as we are concerned, the law is sufficient. With regard to the general law of the country (writing without any official or special knowledge) I can understand that a doubt may be entertained on the subject, although I, personally, and as matter of conjecture, cannot but think that if the law as it stands were enforced it might be well enough. I say this, inasmuch as in cases attended with grievous bodily harm, an indictment may be framed so as to carry penal consequences, even so high as penal servitude for life.

I know of no kind of assault, now summarily punishable, which should be declared only triable at sessions or assize.

I do not wish for any extension of the power of imprisonment now vested in the magistrate for assaults. I do very earnestly desire that in this rich district, and with the class of offenders with whom I am called upon to deal, that I may have the power of fine up to 50% (fifty). Two months, or even one month imprisonment in default, the present term, would do well enough.

I wish also that I had power to deal with petty cases of indecent assault, common enough ; if these were included in the forms of the six months Act for the protection of women and children, it would be well enough.

In any case I earnestly deprecate the addition to our powers of ordering offenders to be flogged. This is quite an improper power to be exercised by any single individual in the country. A reaction against the law would be the certain consequence of any such provision.

With regard to the success (or the reverse) of the flogging powers given by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 47., I would venture to say, with all deference and respect to Mr. Secretary Cross, that I have not any experience or knowledge which would entitle me to offer an opinion.

I am, &c.

ALEX. D. KNOX.

From Sheriffs and Sheriffs-Substitute (Scotland).

LINLITHGOW, CLACKMANNAN, and KINROSS; ROXBURGH, BERWICK,
and SELKIRK; FIFE; PERTH; STIRLING and DUMBARTON; ARGYLL;
ABERDEEN and KINCARDINE; RENFREW and BUTE; CAITHNESS,
ORKNEY, and SHETLAND; PEEBLES; BANFF, ELGIN, and NAIRN;
INVERNESS.

Sir, Edinburgh, November 10, 1874.

The sheriffs having each received your letter of 15th October last, thought it well before replying to meet to exchange views and discuss the questions submitted to them.

We, the undersigned sheriffs, have now the honour to send you, for Mr. Secretary Cross's information, and in accordance with his request, the following observations and opinion, in which we all concur :—

1. We think the penal law of assault requires some amendment, and refer to the observations subjoined to explain the nature and extent of what we think requisite.

2. We think not.

3. We think not.

4. We think it should, in Scotland, be extended to all cases of aggravated crimes committed against the person. See our observations.

5. Flogging as a punishment for criminals above 16 years of age was in Scotland abolished "in all cases of theft or crime committed against person or property," by statute 25 & 26 Vict. c. 18.

The part of the Act, s. 2., repealing the common law powers of the criminal courts to inflict flogging, was enacted, so far as we know, without being recommended by any Royal Commission, or exciting much, if any, professional notice in Scotland.

Its policy was speedily reversed as regards England and Ireland, for the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., referred to in this and the preceding question, was passed in the following year. It, however, applies only to offences against certain statutes which are expressly limited in their application to England and Ireland; and is thus inoperative in Scotland. There is, therefore, no experience in this country of its working to enable us to answer this question. We may add that the kind of offences in England punished by flogging under this last statute have always been crimes at common law in Scotland.

But, in explanation of our first and fourth answers, we have to observe that antecedent to 1862 the Lords Commissioners of Justiciary, sitting in the High Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh, or in the Circuit Court, and the sheriff sitting with a jury, had undoubted power to add "corporal pains"—that is to say, flogging—to the other pains of law in any sentence for crime against the person tried before them. The last recorded instance in which such a sentence was pronounced appears to have been by the Lords of Justiciary in the case of James M'Gowan, who, for assault with intent to ravish, was sentenced in 1831 "to be whipped through the town of Haddington, and thereafter to be transported for seven years."—Bell's Notes to Hume's Commentaries, page 303.

The Lord Advocate, as Public Prosecutor in Scotland, has power to direct any case of criminal violence to be tried before the Lords of Justiciary, or he may remit it for trial before the sheriff, if within the competency of that Judge, who has power to pronounce a more or less severe sentence according as the case is tried by him with or without a jury; but no sheriff can pronounce a sentence of penal servitude, or of more than two years imprisonment with or without hard labour. The practical result of this system is that cases of crime against the person, of an aggravated kind only, are tried before the Lords of Justiciary. Less aggravated crimes of the kind are usually tried before the sheriffs.

We have not reliable statistics on which to assert with confidence that there has been in Scotland any more than an ordinarily rapid increase in crimes against the person since 1862, but we think that we are warranted in saying that since 1831, and more particularly of late years, and in large towns, crimes of violence and of aggravated violence have increased, and we believe that increase is more than is due simply to increased population.

If, in addition, it be found that in England the passing of the Act of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. has been efficacious in diminishing the amount of the particular kinds of aggravated assaults to which it refers, we are disposed to draw the inference that the power to

sentence to flogging, combined with its discreet exercise, is efficacious to diminish crimes of violence, and ought to exist.

On these grounds we venture to express the opinion that where in Scotland any person is convicted before the Lords Commissioners of Justiciary of the crime of assault, or any other crime against the person, a power to flog, similar to that conferred in England by the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., should be conferred upon the courts, and that the Act of 25 & 26 Vict. c. 18., so far as inconsistent with that power, should be repealed.

We do not think that circumstances at present call for the revival of the power of flogging in the sheriff.

There is still a large number of persons, who, some on principle, but most from kindly sensibility, have a strong repugnance to the infliction of corporal punishment. The comparatively infrequent infliction of such a sentence, and then only with the sanction and authority of a supreme judge, and in cases of an aggravated kind, would, we think, reconcile most of these persons to the limited revival of the power which we have indicated; but we doubt whether the extension of the power to other judges of less authority would not excite alarm and rouse opposition to what in itself might be a salutary measure. We therefore deprecate, for the present, the restoration, even to the sheriff sitting with a jury, and still more the extension to any other inferior court or judge, of the power to flog adult criminals.

We believe and expect that the knowledge brought home to the criminal classes by a few examples, that the court has again the power to flog, and that in cases of personal violence it may and will be exercised, and that the power to inflict such punishment may be extended to other courts and to other cases, will deter from crimes of violence, and may have a good effect in deterring from other crimes also.

We have, &c.

GEO. MONRO,

Sheriff of Linlithgow, Clackmannan, and Kinross ;

G. H. PATTISON,

Sheriff of Roxburgh, Berwick, and Selkirk ;

JAS. ARTHUR CRICHTON,

Sheriff of Fife ;

JAMES ADAM,

Sheriff of Perthshire ;

ROBT. B. BLACKBURN,

Sheriff of Stirling and Dumbarton ;

ALEX. FORBES IRVINE,

Sheriff of Argyll ;

J. GUTHRIE SMITH,

Sheriff of Aberdeen and Kincardine ;

PATRICK FRASER,

Sheriff of Renfrew and Bute ;

GEO. H. THOMS,

Sheriff of Caithness, Orkney, and Shetland ;

G. NAPIER,

Sheriff of Peeblesshire ;

BEN. R. BELL,

Sheriff of Banff, Elgin, and Nairn ;

W. IVORY,

Sheriff of Inverness-shire.

BERWICK.

Sir,

Dunn, Berwickshire, November 16, 1874.

In answer to the queries transmitted to me by your desire on 30th ult., regarding the repression of crimes of violence, I have the honour to state my opinion as follows:—

1 and 4. I am of opinion that in the case of all assaults accompanied by brutal violence, and especially in such committed on women and children, flogging should be authorised as part of the punishment.

2. I do not think that any change is called for in regard to the kinds of assault which may be tried before the sheriff, as distinguished from those which may be tried only before the Court of Justiciary.

3. It would, I think, tend materially to diminish the expense of criminal procedure if the maximum fine or maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed by the sheriff under his summary jurisdiction, *i.e.*, without a jury, were extended; but whether such a change is desirable on other grounds, is a question which greatly depends on the amount of public confidence reposed in the office of sheriff, and it is not a change which I would myself strongly urge.

5. I have had no judicial experience under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

GEORGE DICKSON,
Sheriff Substitute of Berwickshire

ABERDEEN AND KINCARDINE.

Sir, Sheriff's Chambers, Aberdeen, October 30, 1874.

I have received the circular dated 15th inst., which has been issued by Mr. Secretary Cross, with reference to the repression of crimes of violence.

I shall answer the five queries which the circular contains in the order in which they are put.

1. In Scotland there is no limit short of corporal or capital punishment to the sentence which may be passed for an aggravated assault. I am therefore of opinion that in this matter, subject to the observations which I shall make upon the fourth query, our penal law is sufficiently stringent.

2. Looking to our system by which prosecutions for crime are regulated by responsible public functionaries, it seems unnecessary that there should be any change in this respect.

3. I am very clearly of opinion that the maximum fine which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction, ought to be extended to at least 100*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment to six months.

4. I am of opinion that it should be made competent in Scotland as in England, to authorise flogging for robberies accompanied by great personal violence. As to the extension of the punishment of flogging I speak with much diffidence. I am bound to say that during nearly ten years of judicial experience in Edinburgh and here, I have never had a case brought before me in which I should have thought it right to pronounce a sentence of flogging. Crimes of brutal violence are of rare occurrence among Scotch people, and as I believe that the degradation which an ordinary Scotchman would feel, if subjected to the punishment of flogging, would probably so demoralise him and destroy his self-respect, as almost to make his reform hopeless, I am unable to recommend that corporal punishment should be made competent, except perhaps in the most aggravated cases of assault, and where the accused person has been tried by a jury.

5. The Act of Parliament here referred to does not extend to Scotland.

I have read this letter to my colleague, Mr. Dove Wilson, who has been a sheriff substitute for ten years, and he concurs with me in the opinions which I have expressed

I am, &c.

JOHN COMRIE THOMSON,
Sheriff Substitute of Aberdeen
and Kincardine.

ABERDEEN AND KINCARDINE.

Sir, Sheriff's Chambers, Aberdeen, November 4, 1874.

I have had the honour to receive your communication of 15th October 1874, regard to the punishment of crimes of violence.

My colleague, Mr. Comrie Thomson, having shown me the replies which he proposed making, I respectfully state that I concur in his views, and therefore do not trouble you with a separate reply.

I have, &c.

J. DOVE WILSON,
Sheriff Substitute of Aberdeen
and Kincardine.

AYRSHIRE.

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Kilmarnock, December 7, 1874.

In compliance with your directions contained in the printed circular dated 15th October last, I beg leave respectfully to state that I am and have long been of opinion that the sheriff's summary jurisdiction in cases of assault should be, at the very least, extended to six months instead of being 60 days, as at present.

I would not be disposed to confine this to cases of assault alone. I think the sheriff's summary jurisdiction generally should be at least six months. As it is, under the recent Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871, the sheriff has power summarily to sentence to nine months imprisonment with hard labour any one who assaults a constable in the discharge of his duty, while he can only send a man to prison for 60 days, however brutally he may have assaulted his own wife, if tried summarily.

I think the sheriff should have power to order flogging, at all events on a second conviction of assault by a husband on his wife; the only fear I have is for the wife's personal safety on the husband's liberation after so degrading a punishment, but I am satisfied something far more deterrent than mere imprisonment is necessary to put a stop to a species of crime alarmingly on the increase in this district.

I think the sheriff should have a discretionary power to order flogging in other cases of brutal violence as well as wife beating.

The Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., to which you refer, does not apply to Scotland; indeed flogging or whipping ordered by a criminal court is very much in desuetude here. The Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 18. provides that no offender in Scotland above 16 years of age shall be whipped for theft, or for any crime against person or property.

So far as my experience goes, whipping in the case of young boys under 16 is most efficacious in putting down petty crime.

I have, &c.

THOMAS ANDERSON,

Sheriff Substitute of Ayrshire
for nearly 22 years.

AYR.

Return to Circular from the Home Office dated 15th October 1874 (received 30th October).

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Ayr, November 18, 1874.

Having regard to the general complexion of crime in this county, whether affecting person or property, as exhibited during my tenure of office, extending over 29 years, I am of opinion that the existing criminal process is, on the whole, adequate for all purposes of penal administration.

The queries put in the circular seem to have exclusive reference to cases of assault, respecting which I would observe that it is always competent for the procurator fiscal, when dealing with this class of offences in the first instance, if he should have a doubt in any case of its fitness for summary trial, to take a declaration from the accused, and to institute a precognition, and to report these proceedings to Crown counsel, with whom it lies to remit back such reported cases, either for summary trial or for trial by the sheriff with a jury; and if the last be the instruction of Crown counsel, the sheriff's power of imprisonment extends to two years.

When cases of assault are dealt with summarily the infliction of imprisonment within the limit of 60 days, without the option of a fine (within the limit of 10*l.*), has, in my apprehension, appeared to be an adequate punishment in the general case, as regards this county, and especially its southern division, in which I am located.

My position and experience do not enable me to express any opinion on the special subject of flogging.

I have, &c.

J. ROBISON, Advocate,
Sheriff Substitute of Ayrshire
at Ayr.

ARGYLL AND INVERNESS.

Sir, Court House, Fort William, November 16, 1864.

With reference to your circular of the 15th ult., on the subject of the more effectual repression of the crimes of violence, I beg most respectfully to submit the following replies to the queries therein put to me:—

1. In this district assaults of brutal violence are of rare occurrence; but when any such case arises, it is usually remitted to the circuit court, where, generally, it is sufficiently dealt with. If in addition to present powers, it should be in the discretion of the court to direct flogging, the penal law against such cases would, it is thought, be sufficiently stringent.

2. I do not think there are. On the contrary, if the maximum fine, and especially the maximum term of imprisonment, were extended, in courts of summary jurisdiction, many cases now triable by the sheriff and a jury might, with greater certainty and much saving of expense, be disposed of by the sheriff in the summary court.

3. With reference to the answer to query No. 2, it does seem desirable so to extend the maximum fine and the maximum term of imprisonment, which may at present be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction.

4. Courts empowered to deal with assaults of brutal violence should be authorised in the exercise of their discretion to direct flogging, in cases other than those specified in the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.; especially in cases of assault on women and children.

5. It would appear that such has been the case, but offences of the kind in question are not frequently committed in this county.

I have, &c.

JAMES SIMPSON,
Sheriff Substitute of Inverness and
Argyllshire at Fort William.

ARGYLL (INVERARY).

Sir, Inverary, November 12, 1874.

In reply to the questions in the circular letter from the Home Office of 15th ult., I beg respectfully to state,—

1. So far as this district is concerned, the penal law against assaults of brutal violence appears to me sufficiently stringent; but these assaults are rare here, so much so that I seldom find it necessary to add hard labour to a sentence of imprisonment.

2. I think any change in this respect would be inadvisable, as the importance of a case of assault depends nearly as much on its special circumstances as on the nature of the assault, and such a change as the one suggested might lead to an importance attaching to a conviction for assault, which the circumstances of the case would not warrant.

3. I do not think any alteration in the present maximum fine and period of imprisonment in summary cases would be desirable. The infliction of a longer sentence than 60 days imprisonment would be a serious power to put in the hands of a single judge without the check of a jury, in a good many cases without that of almost any public opinion, and who is not obliged and in most cases does not take a note of the evidence.

4. Assaults on women and children are almost unknown here; I never remember to have tried a case in which I should have ordered flogging if I had had the power.

I have, &c.

GEORGE HOME,
Sheriff Substitute of Argyllshire at Inverary.

BANFF.

1. I do not venture to answer this question, as it falls more to the judges of the supreme court than to inferior magistrates to answer it.

2. I know of none.

3. I think it is most desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction, that is, sheriff courts, should be extended.

4. The sheriff has no power to pronounce a sentence under the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. I am not aware of any case of flogging under this Act.

JAMES GORDON,

Sheriff Substitute of Banffshire.

TOBERMORY (MULL).

Sir,

Edinburgh, 8, Forres Street, November 27, 1874.

I was duly favoured with your circular of 29th ult, enclosing circular letter issued by direction of Mr. Secretary Cross, dated 15th ult.

In reference to the five queries submitted in that letter, I have to explain that in the remote Highland district in which I have administered justice for about 10 years, the population is very peaceably disposed, and crimes of the violent nature referred to in the queries, are of very rare occurrence; the ordinary crimes of the district being trifling breaches of the peace, and assaults arising in most cases from excess of drinking, and are fairly met by the penalties which may be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction. Accordingly, I do not feel myself qualified, from personal experience, to express an opinion on the points raised in the several queries. I have, however, no hesitation in expressing an opinion that flogging should be authorised for assaults on women and children.

I am, &c.

HUGH ROSS,

Sheriff Substitute of Argyllshire at
Tobermory, Mull.

CAMPBELTOWN.

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Campbeltown, November 7, 1874.

In answer to your communication of 29th October, and the circular letter from the Home Secretary's office enclosed therein, I beg to state with reference to the points on which the views of myself and others are requested:—

1. I am not aware that any deficiency is found in practice in the stringency of the penal law of Scotland in regard to cases such as are here mentioned, but I think the mode of punishment might with advantage be extended as suggested in answer number 4.

2. This is a matter which, in Scotland, rests very much with the Lord Advocate and his deputed, and I do not consider any change called for.

3. I think the maximum fine and maximum term of imprisonment might be extended with propriety to 30*l*. and six months respectively.

4. I think an Act with similar provisions to the Act here referred to, and embracing in addition assaults on women and children, the use of the knife, and thefts by notorious thieves, should be passed for Scotland, leaving the mode of punishment to the discretion of the judge, according to the circumstances.

5. I understand in England, to which and Ireland this Act alone applies, flogging has been found very efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is authorised.

I may add that there is power to punish juvenile offenders by whipping in Scotland under the Acts 14 & 15 Vict. c. 27. and 25 Vict. c. 18., and I have had cases where that mode of punishment would have been desirable, but have been unable to award it from difficulty in finding a person to inflict it. It should be made obligatory on some official connected with the prison to carry out such sentences either by himself or a substitute, under, of course, proper oversight.

I am, &c.

JAMES GARDINER, S. S.

DUMBARTON.

ANSWERS by the Sheriff Substitute of the county of Dumbarton to the prefixed queries.

1. I am of opinion that the penal law against the crimes mentioned in this query is not sufficiently stringent. The parties who commit such crimes do not in general expe-

rience much personal discomfort from imprisonment, even when conjoined with hard labour; while, on the other hand, they regard the punishment of flogging with feelings of terror and alarm. I have no doubt, therefore, that as a deterrent flogging is more efficacious upon this class of criminals than any other species of punishment that could be resorted to.

2. I am not aware of any species of assault which may now be summarily punished which ought to be made triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I am of opinion that the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed summarily by sheriff courts, and which is at present sixty days, ought to be extended to four months.

With respect to the punishment of fine, I would venture to recommend that it should be restricted to cases of simple breach of the peace, that is, breach of the peace unaccompanied by any other offence. At present, in burgh courts, fine, as a rule, is the punishment awarded in all cases tried by the magistrates, and these, besides breach of the peace, include assault, malicious mischief, and petty theft.

4. I am of opinion that it would be desirable to extend the punishment of flogging to assault by a man on his wife and children.

5. I have no doubt that flogging has had the effect of diminishing the crimes referred to in this query.

W. C. STEELE,

November 5, 1874.

Sheriff Substitute of the county of Dumbarton.

ELGIN.

Sir,

Elgin, N.B., November 2, 1874.

I beg to acknowledge Mr. Selwin-Ibbetson's circular letter of 15th October last, on the subject of crimes of violence.

My experience as principal resident magistrate of the county of Elgin extends to upwards of 12 years. During that period I have had very few cases of what could be called assaults of brutal violence. Such as I have had have been almost always committed under the influence of drink. I have had occasion to observe that the punishment of imprisonment had a salutary effect in all these cases. I am glad to be able to add that, within the last few years, assaults of all kinds within this county have been undergoing considerable and increasing diminution. Subject to these general remarks, I beg to reply to your queries, as follows, viz. :—

1. In so far as regards my own experience I have not found the present state of the law insufficient.

2. The selection of the court is at present practically in the hands of the Lord Advocate and his deputed. Aggravated assaults are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of local police magistrates, by sect. 413 of "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862." It has never been the practice for justices of the peace or quarter sessions in Scotland to try for such offences.

3. I do not think that the jurisdiction of non-professional magistrates should be extended. In the only other courts in Scotland to which this question can apply, namely, the sheriff courts, the point involved is, how far the judge shall be empowered to award punishment without the intervention of a jury; but this is more a point of constitutional law, than one affecting the repression of any special description of crime.

4. I have had no personal experience of any cases for which I should consider it necessary to do so.

5. I believe it has, but I have had no opportunity of personal observation.

I have, &c.

D. MACLEOD SMITH,
Sheriff Substitute.

FIFE.

Sir,

Court House, Cupar Fife, November 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of a copy of your circular to magistrates on the subject of the repression of crimes of violence, dated 15th ult., transmitted to me by the Crown Agent, Edinburgh, under date 29th ult., and I have now the honour to submit for your consideration the following observations on the points referred to in your circular.

I have to premise that I have held office as sheriff substitute of Fife for nearly 10 years, the first four in the Western or Dunfermline District, the remainder of the time here. In each district there is a very large mining population, and I may say that I entered on my duties under the expectation of finding a considerable number of cases of "assaults of brutal violence." It is right that I should state that although such cases do occasionally occur, they are not very numerous, nor do I think that they are upon the increase. There is no doubt a considerable number of assaults upon wives, but in the great majority of instances the violence cannot be properly described as "brutal;" and I find that adhering to a general rule, which I soon laid down, that assaults on wives should be invariably punished with imprisonment without the option of a fine, had a most salutary effect.

1. By the law of Scotland, assaults are punishable with an "arbitrary punishment," that is, any penalty short of death may be inflicted according to the discretion and the jurisdiction of the court trying. The Lord Advocate, through his deputes, selects the court of trial in all the more serious cases. The sheriff court is competent, with a jury, to inflict two years imprisonment, and should it be thought that this is an inadequate punishment, the case is directed to be tried in the Court of Justiciary, which may inflict the longest sentence of penal servitude. Unless therefore a new kind of punishment is to be authorised, I do not see that any change is required in the machinery of the law, and I should strongly deprecate any change which would interfere with the discretion of the Crown in selecting the court of trial or of the court in passing sentence. The only suggestion of a change on the kind of punishment which I have heard made is the proposal to introduce flogging, which is referred to in the 4th head of the circular, and which I shall therefore notice in its place.

2. For the reason explained under the last head I am decidedly against declaring any kinds of assault not triable before the sheriff. At present every crime may be tried by the sheriff, except murder, rape, robbery, and fire-raising, and the introduction of any addition to this list would, I think, be most inexpedient. The discretion vested in the Lord Advocate and his deputes to select the Court of Justiciary in cases of more aggravated assault, is a sufficient guarantee that really serious cases shall not fail to receive adequate punishment.

3. I am of opinion that it is desirable that the maximum term of imprisonment which may be inflicted by a sheriff summarily (that is sitting without a jury), should be raised to six months. At present it is 60 days. In cases of assaults on wives, it is of the greatest importance that the trial shall take place as soon as possible. The delays which are inseparable from securing a trial by jury when imprisonment for 60 days is thought an inadequate punishment, are very apt to lead to the escape of the criminal. If he is admitted to bail (which it is his right to get) he very often has succeeded in softening his wife's feelings towards him, and the tale which she then tells in the witness box is scarcely recognisable as a narrative of the same event which she described soon after its occurrence. All this is obviated when the trial takes place summarily, and often the procurator fiscal elects to take the trial summarily, even although he may think that a longer sentence than 60 days would be advisable, because he knows that if the case is delayed for a jury it is exceedingly problematical whether any sentence at all will follow. The sheriff in certain exceptional cases may now inflict, summarily, six months imprisonment (e.g., under the "Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871"), and the power to do so in all cases may, I think, now be safely entrusted to him. I hesitate, however, to extend the jurisdiction of non-professional police judges.

4. I am not prepared to advocate the flogging of adults. It appears to me a retrograde step in civilisation, and only to be justified by the most urgent necessity. As applied to cases of assault on wives, I should dread the effect of the punishment on the after relations of the parties. As at present limited in England, the criminal flogged is not likely ever to meet again the victim of the assault which brought the punishment, but if a husband is flogged for an assault on his wife, the parties spend the remainder of their joint lives together, and the most embittered relations must necessarily subsist. The

same applies to assaults upon children, if they are the criminal's own, and if it be suggested that flogging might be legalised for assaults on women not the wives, and children not the offspring, of the assaulter, the objection at once occurs that a superior protection is extended to strangers to that which a man's own wife and children enjoy.

5. I cannot speak as to this, the Act apparently not applying to Scotland, and at all events not having been brought into operation there.

I have, &c.

A. BEATSON BELL,
Sheriff Substitute of Fife.

FIFE.

Sir,

County Buildings, Dunfermline, November 17, 1874.

In reply to your circular letter of 15th October regarding crimes of violence, I have to state:—

1. That, in my opinion, it would be of advantage if judges and paid magistrates were empowered to order a culprit to be flogged in addition to the ordinary punishment. The knowledge of the fact that this punishment may be awarded would of itself act as a deterrent; and I think that it is owing to this that garrotting is of less frequent occurrence than it was.

2. None.

3. Yes. At present my summary jurisdiction is limited to a fine of 10*l.* or 60 days imprisonment (with a jury sheriffs can imprison for two years). But if an assault is committed on a constable while in the execution of his duty, I can, under the "Prevention of Crimes Act," give the offender six months imprisonment, or if there is a previous conviction against him, nine months, and that summarily. Again, under the Night Poaching statutes I can (also summarily) give an offender (if for a second offence) six months imprisonment, order him to find caution for his good behaviour for two years, and failing his doing so, order him to be kept to hard labour for 12 months longer. I instance these two cases to show that I am entrusted with a power under certain statutes which I cannot exercise in ordinary summary cases. In my opinion it would be of advantage to the public if the summary jurisdiction of the sheriffs were extended, and trial by the sheriff and a jury abolished. This would save expense to the public and annoyance to jurors, it would conduce to the rapid administration of justice, and in many cases it would prevent justice from being defeated altogether; for, unfortunately, it is my experience that if any time is allowed to elapse between the apprehension of a criminal and his being brought to the bar, and this must be the case when the prisoner is to be tried by a jury, witnesses are tampered with or threatened, and it is with difficulty the prosecutor can present to the jury evidence sufficient to justify a conviction.

4. I would leave it to the discretion of the judge to order flogging for any kind of violence, whether committed on man, woman, or child. It is within the memory of many now living when it was not uncommon to see a man whipped through a town; in fact it was a common punishment.

5. I believe it has, and believing this, I desire to see the punishment extended; but I would have the instruments employed issued by Government, of uniform pattern, weight, &c., and for juveniles I would substitute leather taws for the birch, which is an article unknown in Scotland.

I am, &c.

W. LAMOND,
Sheriff Substitute of Fife.

FORFAR.

Sir, Ramornie, Ladybank, N.B., November 5, 1874.

I had the honour of receiving your letter of the 15th ult., and in answer thereto, have to state that, so far as I can judge, the law in Scotland as to assaults does not need amendment except as follows:—

I would respectfully suggest, for the consideration of Mr. Secretary Cross, that in all cases of violence to the person tried before a jury it might be made competent for the jury, if they saw fit, to add to a verdict of guilty a recommendation that the offender should be flogged, and the presiding judge, if he approved of the said recommendation, might thereupon, in addition to any other punishment, direct that the said offender shall be flogged.

It may be that certain assaults, at present tried summarily, might with advantage be tried before a jury, but it humbly appears to me that in Scotland that matter may easily be regulated by an order pronounced by the Lord Advocate.

I have, &c.

FREDK. MAITLAND HERIOT,
Sheriff of Forfarshire.

FORFAR.

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Forfar, October 31, 1874.

The Crown Agent for Scotland has handed me the circular containing five queries, which I now answer seriatim.

1. In Scotland the punishment for an assault depends upon the court in which it is tried. It may be tried in the High Court of Justiciary, or before a sheriff and a jury, or before a sheriff summarily. In the High Court there is no limit to the punishment, which may be penal servitude for any period short of life. The sheriff, however, is restricted to two years hard labour in his jury court, and to sixty days hard labour in the summary court.

It rests with the Lord Advocate to decide in which of these three courts an assault is to be tried.

My answer to the first query is, that I consider the penal law in Scotland is sufficiently stringent, provided the discretion of the Lord Advocate is properly exercised in selecting the court where the case is to be tried. I also refer to my answer to the fourth query.

2. This query refers more to English than Scotch procedure, and is answered by my explanation of Scotch procedure in answer to query 1.

3. I think it is desirable that these fines and terms of imprisonment be extended, because any error in judgment on the part of the Lord Advocate in selecting the court of trial, or on the part of his deputes, can be remedied by giving increased power to the sheriff.

4. Flogging might be introduced with marked effect in the case of wife beating, a crime on the increase.

5. I have had no experience in the working of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I remain, &c.

ALEX. ROBERTSON,
Sheriff Substitute of Forfarshire.

FORFAR.

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Dundee, November 14, 1874.

Your circular, dated 15th October, on the subject of crimes of violence, having been drawn up with special reference to English criminal procedure, I may be pardoned if, instead of replying seriatim to the queries which it contains, I deal with its subject generally.

The existing system of procedure in Scotland in cases of assault is briefly as follows :—

(1.) In towns at least (and the vast majority of the cases to which your circular refers occur in towns) all cases, whatever their nature, are in the first instance brought before the police court, which is presided over, not by a stipendiary magistrate, but by the bailies of the burgh, who take the duty in rotation, and in which the maximum sentence that can be imposed is a fine of 5*l.* or 60 days imprisonment, with caution to keep the peace for six months under a penalty of 10*l.* or a further imprisonment not exceeding 30 days. (2.) As the law stands at present, the police court may dispose finally of all cases of assault except "assault to the danger of life, or assault whereby any limb has

“ been fractured, or assault with any knife or lethal weapon where effusion of blood has followed, or assault aggravated by two previous convictions of that crime, or assault with intent to ravish.” (3.) All cases of assault falling within the foregoing exception are remitted by the magistrate sitting in the police court to the sheriff, who, after making an investigation and, if necessary, consulting the Crown authorities (the Lord Advocate and his deputes), disposes of them either (a.) summarily, in which case the maximum sentence he can inflict is a fine of 10*l.* or 60 days imprisonment; or (b.) with the assistance of a jury, in which case he can inflict two years imprisonment, or, should the offence be thought of too serious a nature to be dealt with in the sheriff court, reserves it for the next half-yearly Circuit Court of Justiciary, where it may in the discretion of the judge be visited with any punishment up to penal servitude for life. (4.) Flogging is not at present a legal punishment in Scotland except for juvenile male offenders under 16 years of age.

Such being our present system, I venture most respectfully, and with special reference to the queries of your circular, to recommend the following changes:—

1. I think that police magistrates should be declared incompetent to try cases of assault upon a wife or upon a child aggravated by one previous conviction of the same offence, and should be required to remit all such cases to the sheriff. (This recommendation is made on the assumption that the constitution of the police courts remains as it is at present. Were these courts presided over by trained magistrates, I should be disposed to recommend a considerable extension of their jurisdiction).

2. I am decidedly of opinion that the summary jurisdiction of the sheriff should be enlarged to the extent of giving him power, sitting without a jury, to impose a fine of 20*l.* or a sentence of six months imprisonment. I should not, however, be disinclined to give the accused the option, unless when the prosecutor in his complaint limited the penalty to 60 days imprisonment, of demanding to be tried by a jury.

3. I think that flogging should be legalised as a punishment for all males (a.) convicted of garrotting, or (b.) convicted of assault with a knife, or (c.) convicted for the third time of assaulting their wives or children, and that the power of awarding it as part of the punishment in such cases should be given to the sheriff as well as to the Court of Justiciary. I make this recommendation with extreme reluctance, but the prevalence of crimes of violence, which have, I regret to say, been very numerous of late in this town, seems to show that our present system of punishment is not sufficiently deterrent, while the experience of England encourages the belief that an extension to Scotland of the principles of the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. may be attended with good results.

I have, &c.

JOHN CHEYNE,

Sheriff Substitute of Forfarshire
at Dundee.

INVERNESS (LOCHMADDY).

Sir, Lochmaddy, N.B., November 11, 1874.

The Crown Agent has sent me a copy of the circular letter dated 15th ultimo, addressed by you to each of the judges of the Court of Justiciary, and to each of the sheriffs and sheriff substitutes in Scotland, and has requested me, at my convenience, to send you my observations and opinion on the points mentioned in the circular.

I presume that I am asked to reply to the questions put in the circular letter only so far as I may have drawn inferences and formed an opinion from my experience in this district of Inverness-shire, of which I have been sheriff substitute about 33 years. On this understanding I beg to reply:—

1. That assaults of brutal violence and indecent assaults are not of frequent occurrence here, and the law as now in operation seems sufficiently stringent in regard to the cases that occur.

2. That my experience in this district does not lead me to the opinion that any cases which may now be summarily punished should be triable only at assizes.

3. That nothing has occurred here, so far as I remember, to render it desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. That no cases of violence have occurred in this district in which I would have recommended flogging.

5. That no case to which the punishment of flogging is authorised by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. has occurred in this district.

I have, &c.

C. SHAW,

Sheriff Substitute of
Inverness-shire at Lochmaddy.

INVERNESS.

Sir,

Inverness, December 21, 1874.

With reference to the points raised in the five questions specified in your circular (dated 15th October last), in regard to the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of the crimes of violence now unhappily so common among certain classes of the population, I beg leave to observe—

1. That the penal law against assaults of brutal violence is not sufficiently stringent. In such cases the judge should have power to award the punishment of flogging with or without imprisonment.

2. There are no cases of assault triable in Scotland at quarter sessions. Assaults may be summarily punished by the justices in petty sessions, or by the sheriff, but there are no cases of assault which may now be summarily punished which should be declared triable only at the assizes.

3. It is not desirable that the maximum fine or maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. The Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. does not extend to Scotland. But power to award punishment of flogging should be extended in Scotland to all cases of robbery, cases of aggravated and indecent assaults upon women and children, rape and defilement of women, assaults by persons armed, and cases of throwing corrosive fluid on a person with intent to do bodily harm.

5. Flogging has been efficacious in cases for which it is authorised as a punishment by 25 Vict. c. 18. and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 105. s. 74.

I have, &c.

PATRICK BLAIR,

Sheriff Substitute of the
County of Inverness.

LANARKSHIRE.

Sir,

(Yours) Sheriff Chambers, Glasgow, November 26, 1874.

Referring to your circular of the 15th ultimo (received through the Crown Agent for Scotland), requesting my answer for the information of the Right Hon. Mr. Cross to certain questions regarding the administration of justice in cases of violence, I have the honour to request you will lay the following answers to these questions before him:—

1. "Is the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling
"assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, sufficiently
"stringent, and, if not, in what way should it be amended?"

Assaults of brutal violence can be punished in Scotland by fine or imprisonment, and so far as these are adequate and proper kinds of punishments, the amount of the fine and the duration of the imprisonment which may be inflicted for them are not insufficient.

2. "Are there any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which
"should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions?"

This question does not apply properly to Scotland, where there are no assizes, and where quarter sessions are not in use to try criminal cases.

Taking as their equivalents the Court of Justiciary and the sheriff assisted by a jury, I would observe that cases of serious assault ought to be tried before one or other of these courts, and not summarily before a magistrate or sheriff. But as the difference

between the cases appropriate respectively for summary or more formal trial is one of degree not of kind, I do not think they could be defined by statute.

In connexion with this subject, I should observe that it ought to be made competent to the sheriff before whom a case of assault (or any other offence) is being tried summarily to remit it for trial before a jury, if he is satisfied that the punishment which he could impose on summary trial would be inadequate. By this means cases which, from want of sufficient information by the police at the commencement of the trial, or other causes, are punished inadequately on summary conviction, would be punished with adequate severity.

3. "Is it desirable that the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed
"for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended?"

The maximum fine and imprisonment which can be imposed by sheriffs on summary trial and by magistrates for assaults is 10*l.* and 60 days. I think it would be hazardous to increase the powers of punishment by unprofessional and sometimes untrained and ignorant magistrates, but I consider that sheriffs (including sheriffs substitute) may be entrusted safely and with benefit to the public with considerably greater power in these respects, as, for example, to fine up to 20*l.* and imprison for six months.

4. "Should flogging be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the
"provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., especially in cases of assaults on
"women and children?"

5. "Has flogging been efficacious in putting down the offences for which it is autho-
"rised as a punishment by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.?"

The Act here referred to does not apply to Scotland, and I am therefore unable to speak from experience of its efficacy or otherwise.

Judging of its working in England from the usual sources of non-official information, I consider that its provisions ought to be extended to Scotland, where the punishment for robbery with violence is inadequate, and involves an unnecessary difference between the laws of different parts of the country.

The frequency of brutal assaults on women and children, and the evident insufficiency of the law at present to prevent them, have led me reluctantly to the opinion that they ought to be made punishable by flogging. I am the more satisfied of this from observing that imprisonment, as at present carried out, produces an increase of comfort in food, clothing, and lodging of the lower classes, while the restraint to which they are subjected is not sufficient for punishment, unless where it lasts for several months.

If flogging is legalised in Scotland, I consider—

- (1.) That it should not be imposed except after verdict of a jury.
- (2.) That the assaults for which it should be authorised should be characterised in the indictment by some such word as "brutal," thus laying on the jury the responsibility of determining whether the assault is of so aggravated a kind as to deserve flogging.
- (3.) That it is unnecessary and would be inexpedient at first to authorise its infliction by inferior courts.

By limiting the power to the supreme court, it would be competent to the Lord Advocate to have the punishment applied in serious cases, and deliberation and uniformity in the application of the law would be secured, whereas considerable diversity of practice would probably exist if sheriffs had the same power. Its exercise by them would also be apt to raise strong odium against them among the friends of those who had been punished, which in the case of resident judges would be an evil.

I have, &c.

W. G. DICKSON,
Sheriff of Lanarkshire.

LANARK (HAMILTON).

Sir,

Hamilton, November 16, 1874.

(1.) The questions which have by your order been forwarded to me in common with the other sheriffs and sheriffs substitute of Scotland are, I may premise, framed more with reference to English procedure than to our Scotch system of criminal practice. Cases of serious assault, which are deemed by the district authorities as too aggravated to be dealt with by sentences of 60 days imprisonment, are reported to Crown counsel (the Lord Advocate and his deputed), who may order them to be tried by a sheriff and

jury, or even by the Supreme Criminal Court. By the former court a sentence of two years imprisonment may be inflicted, by the latter court imprisonment to the above extent or penal servitude, which as you are aware cannot be for a less period than five years. I have little doubt that such a case as that I saw reported in the newspapers the other day, where a man in England convicted before the quarter sessions of an assault upon his wife, by repeatedly knocking her down, and then hounding his dog on her till she was badly bitten in five different places, would, under the system of Scotland, have been tried by the Supreme Criminal Court, by whom a heavy sentence of penal servitude would have been passed. Therefore, as regards our criminal law with reference to assaults of brutal violence (apart from the consideration of the advisability of the lash), I would say in answer to question 1st, that it is sufficiently stringent.

While, however, in theory I believe it to be sufficiently stringent, I would venture to point out to you what, in practice, seems to me to be a matter requiring some remedy. In all the burgh courts in Scotland (Edinburgh excepted, where by arrangement a sheriff substitute discharges some part of the duties of a burgh magistrate), unpaid magistrates, and I may say without exception untrained men, preside; it frequently happens that, although aggravated cases of assault, and assaults by persons repeatedly previously convicted, ought to be remitted to the sheriffs, in point of practice burgh magistrates seldom do remit. Constantly cases of assault are reported in the newspapers, which *ex facie* of the reports, a sheriff would consider a sentence of imprisonment of 60 days utterly inadequate to meet, and which nevertheless have been visited by the presiding bailies by fines more or less heavy with alternatives of imprisonment. I need not say that in a district where wages are high and fines easily raised among friends, the known fact that a bad assault will only, in all probability, be punished by a fine, has a very bad effect in the way of repression of such offences. I will give an example of a case which recently came under my notice; a man was accused under the Prevention of Crimes Act, of a violent assault on a policeman, accompanied with the disgusting phase of having succeeded in biting the policeman's nose nearly off; the punishment which ensued on conviction by the presiding bailie was a fine of five guineas, with an alternative of imprisonment. The fine, I understand, was raised in the court at the moment of its infliction, and it is obvious that such a sentence was, in the circumstances, no punishment at all, and was calculated to lead to contempt of authority. The explanation of the extensive and mistaken system of fining, which obtains in the burgh courts of Scotland in serious cases of assaults is easily given, and simply is that the fines inflicted in the police courts go into the burgh funds, thereby diminishing the public rates and increasing the popularity of the local administrations. These fines yield, in the cases of some burghs, very large annual revenues, and if anything I have said on this matter should make you deem it advisable that there should be further inquiry, a return from the various Royal, Parliamentary, and police burghs of Scotland, as to their annual revenue from fines, and the nature of the cases where the fine was over twenty shillings, would I believe, elicit abundant evidence of the truth of my assertion that burgh magistrates punish many cases of assault by fines, in which serious sentences of imprisonment without alternative ought to be inflicted.

(2.) The second question, as I have incidentally already explained, is inapplicable to Scotland. With reference, however, to what I have said as to burgh magistrates, and as having some analogy to the question put, I would suggest that it should be made incumbent on burgh magistrates to remit all cases of assault to the sheriff,—(1.) where there have been previous convictions of assault within eighteen months or two years; (2.) where kicking or biting occurs, or the knife, or any lethal weapon has been actually used or even brandished; and (3.) assaults on police in the execution of their duty, and cases of wife-beating. The mere fact that such cases would necessarily be remitted to the sheriff, would, I think, act favourably in the repression of such assaults in burghs, and would have a good effect throughout whole districts, as evidencing the serious light in which such offences would be regarded.

(3.) In answer to the third question, I would say that on no account in Scotland should the present powers of summary jurisdiction be enlarged in the case of burgh magistrates; on the contrary, as I have already indicated, for reasons above stated, I would feel inclined to limit them; nor would I be inclined to extend the summary criminal jurisdiction of the justice of peace courts. There is a wide-spread feeling among the common classes that they do not get justice in the justice of peace courts, and on that ground alone I would not be inclined to extend their powers of sentence; but apart from that, the justices, like the burgh magistrates, are untrained men not conversant with the laws of evidence, and to give to them greater powers than they at present

possess in criminal matters would, I think, be a mistake. It is, I think, advisable that the sentences of summary criminal courts should not be reviewable on the merits, and hence it seems to me to be only right that as far as it is possible, the judges who sit in these courts should be trained men, acquainted with the laws of evidence, so that a panel may not be convicted in a summary court on evidence which would be excluded by a supreme court.

I believe it will be found to be the general impression that sheriffs without a jury should have the power of inflicting sentences of imprisonment of greater length than 60 days, and fines of more than 10*l*. Not long ago I investigated the subject of the criminal jurisdiction of the Sheriff Court (May number of Scotch Journal of Jurisprudence, p. 253), and I am of opinion that sheriffs have the power of inflicting sentences of six months imprisonment or fines up to 50*l*. without the intervention of a jury. Such undoubtedly was the case before the passing of Sir William Rae's Act in 1828. In point of practice now, and, as far as I am aware, since 1828, the more convenient forms provided by Sir William Rae's Act, and the Summary Procedure Act of 1864 have superseded all other criminal procedure before a sheriff without a jury. The limit under both these Acts is the same, viz., 60 days imprisonment. By the 3rd section of the Act of Adjournal of 17th March 1827, it was provided, "If the trial is to be without a jury the libel shall conclude for fine, imprisonment, and banishment (*i.e.*, furth of the county or burgh) or other pains of law competent to be inflicted by the sheriff or magistrate without a jury, and the induciæ (*i.e.*, the time between citation to the trial and the trial itself) shall not be less than six free days." In one view the procedure prescribed here is not summary, but where so heavy a sentence as six months imprisonment is competent, I would not feel inclined to limit a panel's time of preparation for his trial. Although in practice superseded, I cannot see that the mere lapse of practice in the matter can have had any effect in limiting the procurator fiscal's power of bringing cases before the sheriff in the manner prescribed by the section of the Act of Adjournal quoted, where the prayer for sentence is for imprisonment to an extent not exceeding six months or a fine not more than 50*l*., or impairing in any way the limits of a sheriff's jurisdiction. I cannot see that either Sir William Rae's Act of 1828 or the Summary Procedure Act of 1864 in any way directly or impliedly affect the limits of sheriffs' jurisdiction. In these circumstances I incline to answer the third question in the negative. But my expression of opinion proceeds upon my belief as to sheriffs' power of inflicting imprisonment to the extent of six months without the intervention of a jury, and I am well aware that my views are not shared by some of my brother sheriffs. I submit, however, confidently that I am right. I should like this to be authoritatively ascertained, and if it is ascertained to be as I have stated, it should be a direction from the Crown office to procurators fiscal, that whenever cases in their opinion, though hardly warranting the expense and delay of reporting, might yet warrant a more serious sentence than 60 days imprisonment, they should be brought before sheriffs with the formalities described in the above-quoted section of the Act of Adjournal of 1827. If it is ascertained that I am wrong in this matter I certainly think that sheriffs should have the power given to them of inflicting sentences without a jury to the extent of six months imprisonment or a fine of 50*l*., but in cases where heavier sentences may be obtained than those inflictable at present under the summary clauses of Sir William Rae's Act or the provisions of the Summary Procedure Act, I think that the induciæ should be longer than two days, and sheriffs should be required to take the evidence down in writing.

(4.) The Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. is inapplicable to Scotland. I would think it well that its provisions should be extended to Scotland. I am further of opinion that it should be in the power of criminal courts, with the intervention of a jury, to order flogging in cases, (first), of rapes and assaults with intent to ravish; (second), assaults with the knife or firearms; (third), biting, kicking, and cases of assault accompanied with exceptionally brutal violence; (fourth), cases of wife-beating though not exceptionally brutal, if two previous convictions have been recorded against the offender; and (fifth), cases of lewd, indecent, and libidinous practices to children. In no case would I give the power of inflicting the lash to a judge without the intervention of a jury, and this implies that the power of awarding the punishment of the lash (which I regard as a degrading and brutalising one, and merely as an example and deterrent), would not be given to any burgh magistrate or justice of the peace. My views on the subject of the lash are expressed in a letter, a copy of which I enclose, which appeared in the "Scotsman" of 29th and the "Glasgow Herald" of 31st October last. On the last-mentioned date a leader on that letter appeared in the "Glasgow Herald," which I also enclose. I send this article, as you probably would not otherwise see it, and I understand it is your wish

to gather the opinions of the different sections of the community with reference to the lash. My printed letter expresses in a probably more convenient form my ideas as to the lash which I am asked to give. Since the date of my letter further consideration has induced me to the opinion that in no case whatever should the lash be inflicted without the verdict of a jury; and the suggestion in that letter that imprisonment should be made compulsory in certain classes of cases is superseded by the proposal that in all these cases it should be made incumbent on magistrates to remit to sheriff.

(5.) It is a matter of notoriety that flogging has been successful as a deterrent in putting down the offences for which it is authorised by the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., but of course we in Scotland have no personal experience to furnish as to this question.

I may note that the district of which I am sheriff substitute is the chief mining one in Scotland, that it has a population of about 90,000, and that I dispose of between 300 and 400 summary criminal cases in the course of the year.

I am, &c.

WALTER J. SPENS.

THE LASH, AND PUNISHMENTS OF POLICE MAGISTRATES.

" Sir,

" October 27, 1874.

"The popular movement in favour of the lash seems daily to be assuming shape and consistency with reference to prospective legislation as to the punishment of various cowardly classes of offences, and more especially wife-beating. I think there are several considerations which must be carefully weighed before legislation is attempted in this matter. The use of the lash has been introduced in England with marked effect in cases of garrotte and other violent descriptions of robberies, but these are cases which have to do with a hardened set of offenders, mostly previously-convicted thieves and robbers. The class, however, with which the legislation now contemplated would have to deal would be a non-criminal class, that is to say, a working class, providing honestly means for the support of themselves and families. The cat has been abolished in the army, one chief reason of which was that it led to a loss of self-respect. Have we not good reason to doubt that the extensive use of the lash as proposed may have the effect of hardening and self-abasing many of the men to whom it was employed, and destroying their usefulness as members of the community? Again, there is no saying what bitter unhappiness it may breed in many homes, and the prospect of future life to many a wife by whose complaint the assaulting husband has been condemned to the lash would be, indeed, deplorable, even though outward violence might be carefully guarded against. Legislation, for instance, can hardly reach a husband systematically starving his wife and children, or at least not providing them with sufficient food or clothing, not to speak of moral tortures.

"But while there are considerations to be weighed as against the use of the lash in the usual run of cowardly domestic cases, from time to time we hear of cases so atrocious in their savage cruelty and cowardliness that we feel the lash is their only proper punishment, or rather the necessary adjunct of a proper punishment. For instance, the ruffian who set his dog on his wife after knocking her down repeatedly, as recently reported, richly deserved the repeated infliction of lashes as a part of his punishment. The view which we take of the matter is that the lash should not be awarded in usual and ordinary cases of wife-beating unless two, or at least one, previous conviction has been recorded against the offender. In extraordinary cases of domestic brutality the supreme judges and sheriffs should have the option of awarding it, but that only on conviction by a jury. I am of opinion that much of the wife-beating which goes on in Scotland is due to the system of fining, which obtains throughout the police courts of Scotland. We read perpetually of panels, in cases which seem to demand a serious sentence of imprisonment, being let off with fines more or less heavy. Cases of wife-beating occurring in my district are not now frequent, and I believe this to be due to a declared and inflexible rule, that wife-beaters, when proved guilty, receive sentence of imprisonment without the option of a fine. Such also is my rule with reference to assaults on policemen in the execution of their duty, all cowardly assaults on women, all cases of biting, cases of kicking when the assaulted party is on the ground, and cases of assault and breaches of peace connected with party feeling (Orange or Roman Catholic); also second offences, if happening within a year after the first. My experience of police cases, which is now pretty considerable, is that imprisonment is dreaded as a punishment, but that fines are little regarded. I believe in many cases they are raised by a man's friends (sometimes by a subscription in court); or, if colliers, by their brother workers in the same pit—very much with the idea, 'it's you to-day, it may be me to-morrow.' Now very frequently, indeed I think I am not wrong in saying usually, such cases as those which I have adverted to are punished in burgh police courts by fines. There is no difficulty in understanding what the reason of this is. It simply proceeds from the fact that the more fines there are in the burgh police courts (including courts established under the General Police Act of 1862) the more money goes into the burgh funds, and it is true so much the more is saved in the way of burgh rates. But in a district where fines are regarded as little or no punishment, it may well be imagined that inflictions of fines have but light weight in the repression of such offences. Now, sir, I say this system is wrong; it should not be in the power of a burgh magistrate to inflict a fine in cases where, obviously, a more serious punishment should be meted out, and if any measure

is brought forward in Parliament introducing the lash, indeed whether or not, I would suggest that imprisonment should be made compulsory on magistrates in certain classes of cases. I commend the matter to your consideration.

"I am, &c.

"A SHERIFF-SUBSTITUTE."

" 'A Sheriff-Substitute' in to-day's *Herald* directs attention to a question at present interesting the public mind—the punishment of wife-beating and serious assaults, and discusses the question whether it is advisable to visit these offences with the heavier punishment of the lash, or imprisonment without the alternative of a fine. Public feeling on the subject is not always to be trusted. Some of our readers must remember some forty years ago, when law makers and philanthropists were warmly supported in their views about the humanitarian treatment of prisoners. There was a disposition at that time to coddle the prisoners, to induce him to honour and obey the law by kindness, to turn him out of prison, not a jail-bird, but a sort of incipient saint. This was a reaction from a frightful period of prison accommodation and discipline. Our prisons were improved, and there can be no doubt that improvement was made upon some of the prisoners. But the new system did not, upon the whole, work well. The country began to swarm with ticket-of-leave men, and Parliament had at last to interfere, and limit the ticket-of-leave system, whatever was the good conduct of a prisoner, or the recommendation of his chaplain. Public feeling has set just now in an opposite direction. Having got fairly sick of coddling, it has gone to the other extreme, and would lash every rascal who commits an offence which in any way shocks its moral sense. Wife-beating is unfortunately a crime that has always been prevalent in this country among the lower orders, and the beating, as a rule, has always been done in a brutal manner. It would be difficult to show that it is worse at the present moment than ever it was, but public attention has been closely fixed upon the offence of late; and whenever an object comes under the public eye, the public eye becomes microscopic, and enlarges it to an enormous extent.

" 'What shall we do with the brutes who attack their defenceless and helpless wives?' That is the way in which the question is put, and the answer is prompt enough—'Lash them till they roar again'—pay back the wife-beater in his own coin; inflict, as a penalty upon him, the punishment his wife would probably have returned to him if she had had the physical ability. This, however, is far too easy a way of solving the very difficult problem of society's duty towards its criminals. It is just what society does in its most barbarous condition. The lash may be used in some cases with advantage, but we are certain that these cases are rare, and are to be found only among a hardened set of criminals who have gone through years of imprisonment and penal servitude, and whose last state is worse than the first. The cat was applied to the London garroters, and garrotting almost disappeared. It has been argued that the same punishment could produce the same result in wife-beating, assaults with the knife, and other offences of a brutal nature. This, however, does not follow. The London garroters belonged to the hopeless criminal class we have referred to, upon whom imprisonment brought neither shame nor punishment. They could be reached through their backs, and having once tasted the cat, they took good care not to commit the crime which would bring them under its influence a second time. A violent remedy was applied for a crime which had become too frequent, but not quite to the extent imagined by the public. We call it a violent remedy because the descriptions of the punishment were sickening and degrading. If we had it indiscriminately applied now we should either imbrute the public mind or disgust it so much that reaction of feeling would set in stronger in favour of the criminal than it happens at this moment to be against him. On this subject our correspondent, 'A Sheriff-Substitute,' writes admirably. He says:—'The cat has been abolished in the army, one chief reason of which was that it led to a loss of self-respect. Have we not good reason to doubt that the extensive use of the lash as proposed may have the effect of hardening and self-abasing many of the men to whom it is employed, and destroying their usefulness as members of the community? Again, there is no saying what bitter unhappiness it may breed in many homes, and the prospect of future life to many a wife by whose complaint the assaulting husband has been condemned to the lash would be, indeed, deplorable, even though outward violence might be carefully guarded against. Legislation, for instance, can hardly reach a husband systematically starving his wife and children, or at least not providing them with sufficient food or clothing, not to speak of moral tortures.'

"Our correspondent advocates imprisonment without the option of a fine, in cases of serious assault and serious cases of wife-beating. He finds in his own district that imprisonment is a real deterrent, but that fines have no effect whatever in reducing offences. It is nothing for a workman with good wages to pay 20s. or 30s. for a spree in which, out of pure wantonness, he has thrashed one or two people feebler than himself. The sheriff has discovered that the more vicious class of the community who are frequently brought before him are always ready to pay down the fine imposed, sometimes by a subscription among the friends in the court, and in the case of colliers, by a levy from brother workers in the same pit, the feeling being that 'it is your case to-day; it may be mine to-morrow.' We have no doubt whatever that a judicious magistrate ought, and generally does, take note of these circumstances within his jurisdiction, and acts accordingly. The sheriff constantly sitting on the bench has opportunities for studying the crime in his district, and can apply the remedy by being severe when he believes severity is required. It is otherwise with the citizen magistrate, whose term of office is short, and whose judicial duties are only a small part of the work he performs for the public. He does not generally bother himself with the state of crime. Parties come before him, and are hastily judged and punished. The burgh derives a considerable revenue from the fines, and naturally the magistrate does not often use his option of imprisonment

without fine when the fine is likely to be recoverable. We do not blame him harshly, because we believe that in the great majority of cases it would be a mistake for him to use his discretion on the side of severity. Still the present system is far from being perfect. The facility afforded for compounding for offences by a money payment, leads to contempt of the law and an increase of crimes, especially crimes of violence. It seems, for example, monstrous that a man who had boiled a living dog should get off with a guinea fine,* and equally absurd that cases of brutal violence towards women and feeble persons should be dismissed with no heavier penalty. The remedy suggested by 'A Sheriff-Substitute' is to make the punishment of imprisonment compulsory in certain classes of crime. As the law is at present administered the remedy is too sweeping, Mistakes occur on the side of leniency now; it would be worse if they should as frequently occur on the side of severity. The 'Sheriff-Substitute's' own experience seems to us to point in the proper direction. He uses his discretion, and imprisons when he finds that certain offences are becoming more than usually prevalent. We must have sensible permanent judges in all our inferior courts. The unpaid magistrate, a most useful judge in times gone past, and even yet in many rural districts, is quite unsuited for our modern cities. There has been a vast increase of population, and a corresponding increase of criminal offences. The bailie has now to deal with cases which it was never expected he would have to deal with. In fact, the system in large towns has fairly broken down, and everybody feels that if we are to cope with the special brutality of the day by the lash, or an extension of the punishment of imprisonment, our judges must be changed. Our own opinion is that a vigorous administration of the law as it stands, by intelligent judges like 'A Sheriff-Substitute,' is all that is required."

LANARK.

Sir, Sheriff's Chambers, Glasgow, November 24, 1874.

I have your letter of 15th October last, sent to me through the Crown office, Edinburgh, and in reply, and for the information of the Home Secretary, I am of opinion—

1st. That in Scotland the powers of judges are sufficiently stringent to meet cases of trifling assaults. I am of opinion that in cases of assaults of brutal violence as stated under this head, and of indecent assaults, the punishment of imprisonment is quite inadequate, and I think the judge should have power upon conviction by a jury to pronounce a sentence of flogging. It would, however, be necessary that the nature of the violence and assault should be set forth in the charge, so that the presiding judge or magistrate would be under the control of public opinion, and that he and the jury would thus carefully exercise any power conferred by statute to flog.

2nd. None that I know of.

3rd. In my opinion it is highly desirable that the maximum fine or maximum term of imprisonment, which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction, should be extended to at least 20*l.* of fine or six months imprisonment. I exclude in this answer altogether the jurisdiction of citizen magistrates and justices of the peace, for the reason that these magistrates and justices are totally untrained, and under no responsibility to anyone, and that their judgments are so capricious and unequal, that the results of prosecutions before them are highly unsatisfactory.

4th. The Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. does not apply to Scotland. I think it should be extended to Scotland, and that flogging should be authorised for the following offences other than that provided in said Statute, viz. :—

1. Rape.
2. Assaults with intent to ravish.
3. Indecent assaults on children.
4. Assaults upon wives, if it appear that such assaults have been serious and brutal.

5th. This Act has not been in operation in Scotland, and I have no means of judging of its effect.

In giving the answers to the five propositions submitted, it is right that I should state, that I do so, after an experience of eight years as sheriff substitute in Glasgow, and of many years before as an agent (attorney) in the various courts of Lanarkshire.

I am, &c.

Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart.,
Whitehall, London.

JAMES GALBRAITH,
Sheriff Substitute of Lanarkshire.

* This sentence was awarded by a magistrate at Crosshill, near Glasgow, on conviction of a man for boiling a dog alive.—M. S.

LANARKSHIRE.

Criminal Sentences.

Sir,

Sheriff Chambers, Airdrie, November 16, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter of the 15th ult., through the Crown agent for Scotland, and in answer to your questions, I have to state as my opinion,—

I. That the penal law against brutal assaults is not sufficiently stringent.

That the proper form for amendment of it to take would be:—

- (1.) To restore to the Justiciary and Supreme courts the power of ordering flogging to be administered in such cases; to grant the same power to a sheriff or sheriff substitute, when sitting with a jury; and when sitting in the summary court if two previous convictions of assault are proved against the prisoner.
- (2.) To make it imperative (instead of optional) that a sentence on a prisoner convicted of assault shall require him to find security for his good conduct for at least six months.
- (3.) To exclude from the jurisdiction of unpaid magistrates any case of assault in which it is libelled or comes out in evidence that the prisoner has kicked the assaulted party, or bitten him, or used a lethal weapon, or if the assault is on a constable in discharge of his duty, and to render it competent for the magistrate at any time before pronouncing sentence, to remit such case to the sheriff for trial.
- (4.) To give to any sheriff or sheriff substitute the power to direct a case to be tried with a jury (or perhaps even by the Justiciary or Circuit court), if in the course of a summary trial it emerge that such course is rendered expedient by the magnitude of the crime or the existence of local feeling preventing witnesses giving truthful evidence.
- (5.) To extend the sentences competent to be pronounced in the sheriff summary court.
- (6.) To empower cases of robbery to be tried in the sheriff court; and to allow sentence of penal servitude for a term not exceeding five years, to be pronounced by the sheriff or sheriff substitute when sitting with a jury.

Observations.

- (1.) The feeling is so general that flogging ought to be inflicted in cases of brutal violence that it ought to be tried. I would doubt whether more power should be conferred on the sheriff court were it not that I fear, if it were not, the remedy would not in the bulk of cases reach the evil, at least for long. If all the cases where flogging ought to be inflicted were sent to the Supreme Court, the demands on the time of the court would be enormously increased; and also many a case that should be sent would not be sent solely because the case, though one of flogging, would not be one requiring the heavy sentences of imprisonment appropriate in the Supreme Court. Then I think it appropriate the sentence and the punishment should speedily follow the crime, and be inflicted in the district where it took place.
- (2.) Appointing an offender to find caution is, in my opinion, generally more beneficial than fine or imprisonment. To impose fine or imprisonment alone on a man convicted of abusing his wife generally punishes, without protecting, her and her children; and as soon as the fine is paid or the imprisonment at an end, she and they are at the mercy of one who has already shown he knows none. But where a fine is accompanied by an order for caution (security), the offender is forced to borrow from friends who, he knows, will likely resent it if he, by his conduct, causes them to forfeit their money.
- (3.) I do not think heavy cases should be tried by unpaid magistrates. These gentlemen are more subject to impulse, have seldom legal training, and by the inequality of their sentences (according as the bench for the day is composed of firm or soft magistrates, &c., &c.), make the course of justice neither sure nor respected.

II. Some judges doubt whether “lewd, indecent, and libidinous practices” can be competently tried summarily. Even if it can, I do not think it should. It is a grave

crime and seriously affecting character ; and as the witnesses are children, it is peculiarly a case for the functions of a jury. Trial by jury has no necessary effect in increasing the sentence.

III. Very. The maximum fine should be raised from 5*l.* to 20*l.*, and the term of imprisonment from 60 days to four months. In a district such as this I have often felt that while it was expedient the crime should be tried summarily, the imposing of even the maximum penalty of 5*l.* was a perfect mockery. In frequent cases I have seen the money paid by the prisoner, or collected for him, as soon as the clerk of the court had read the sentence.

It is also expedient that the amount of caution should be raised from 10*l.* to 20*l.*, and the time to which it applies increased from 6 to 12 months.

IV. I think it should be authorised for assaults on the police, assaults where the foot or any heavy bruising instrument have been used, and for assaults on women and children of a nature so brutal and indecent as not to be suitable for summary trial, or, if tried summarily, when the offender has twice previously been convicted of the crime of assault.

I have, &c.

J. M. LEES,

Sheriff Substitute of Lanarkshire.

LANARK.

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Lanark, October 31, 1874.

In reply to your letter of 29th October current, enclosing copy of a circular letter from the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated "Whitehall, 15th October 1874," I beg to annex my answers to each of the five several questions therein set forth.

I am, &c.

J. NEIL DYCE,

Advocate and Sheriff Substitute
of Lanarkshire at Lanark.

Answers.

1. The penal law against assaults of brutal violence appears to be sufficiently stringent.

2. I know of none.

3. No. But it seems desirable that assaults tried summarily should, when aggravated by previous convictions within one or two years, be punished by imprisonment without the option of a fine.

4. Flogging should be authorised in cases of assault upon women and children, when such cases are tried by a jury.

Note.—In this answer I have taken no notice of such complaints when tried summarily, because on such occasions I have found it next to impossible to get the parties assaulted to depone in support of the charge.

5. Flogging has not within this district (Upper Ward of Lanarkshire) been imposed, in any of the cases referred to, as part of the sentence.

Note.—In terms of the regulations issued by the Lord Advocate as sanctioned by sec. 6 of 14 & 15 Vict. c. 27., I, on 4th October 1874, appointed George Armstrong, constable in the Lanarkshire police, to administer flagellation to juvenile male offenders, at a salary of 2*l.* per annum.

That salary, however, was disallowed in Exchequer in respect that the officer had not done any duty ; and consequently there is now no person having authority to administer such discipline, but which, if duly enforced, must necessarily have a most deterrent effect upon youths who possess no means of paying a fine and whom it would be inadvisable to subject to the contamination of a prison.—

J. N. D.

LANARK.

Sir, Glasgow, December 7, 1874.

In answer to your circular of 15th October, I beg to annex the following answers to the questions there put. The questions, however, run into each other so much that it is somewhat difficult to separate the answers.

I. The penal law of Scotland is sufficiently stringent in the punishment of such offences, so far as regards the amount of the penalties which can be at present imposed, being those of fine and imprisonment; but it is not sufficiently stringent, in so far as it does not permit of the infliction in aggravated cases, and under due precautions, of personal chastisement, such as flogging, which in my opinion would be in many cases the only effectual deterrent.

II. The distinction here mentioned applies to England; viewed, however, as regards the Scottish equivalents, it would hardly be possible to define by statute what assaults should be sent to the superior courts, except that it might be provided that an accused who had been twice previously convicted should be of necessity remitted to the sheriff, which would prevent an inadequate punishment being inflicted on criminals who are obviously impervious to the effects of a short sentence. Also, as a miscarriage of justice frequently arises by the magistrate or sheriff before whom a prisoner is being tried summarily being unable to pronounce a heavier sentence than 60 days imprisonment, though the evidence led before him shows that such a punishment is quite insufficient, I think it ought to be made competent for every such magistrate, any time before sentence is pronounced, to remit the case to the sheriff, and for the sheriff, any time before sentence is pronounced, to remit the case to be tried before a jury.

III. The maximum fine and imprisonment which can be imposed by sheriffs or thoroughly qualified stipendiary magistrates might be increased with safety and great advantage to 20l. and six months imprisonment respectively (the latter being with hard labour); but as regards unprofessional magistrates, such an extension of power would be dangerous and unadvisable.

IV. The statute in question only affects England, and ought to be extended at once to Scotland. Whatever variance of opinion there may be throughout the country as regards flogging as a punishment for other offences, the opinion of the vast majority of the people of Scotland would be in favour of flogging as a deterrent, to prevent a small criminal minority, who are at war with that majority, from adding to their predatory acts cruel and deliberate violence. With many of such habitual criminals, regular jail-birds, who consider occasional imprisonments as natural incidents in their career, flogging would be the only effectual deterrent.

As regards the present question, however, which applies to offences not contemplated in the above-mentioned statute, brutal assaults, especially such as are committed on women and children, ought to be punishable (at discretion) by flogging, under certain safeguards and conditions, namely, (1) that such a sentence shall only be pronounced after a trial before a jury; and (2) that the offence shall either be charged as "brutal" in the indictment, or be charged as an act committed by a person previously convicted of assault, and therefore apparently an old offender, on whose conduct imprisonment has failed to effect a change for the better.

V. As unfortunately the statute in question does not apply to Scotland, no answer is possible to this question.

I am, &c.

A. ERSKINE MURRAY,
Sheriff Substitute of Lanarkshire.

LANARK (GLASGOW).

Sir,

Sheriff Chambers, Glasgow, December 7, 1874.

In reply to the questions submitted, I beg to give the following answers:—

1. It appears to me that the penal law in Scotland against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand and indecent assaults on the other, is sufficiently stringent if its provisions are sufficiently carried out. When such cases are tried before the High Court of Justiciary or at the assizes, the culprit may be sentenced not merely to a long term of imprisonment but to penal servitude.

When such cases are brought before the sheriff and a jury, he may inflict the punishment of imprisonment for any period not exceeding two years and with or without hard labour. When such cases are tried by the magistrates or the sheriff sitting without a jury, the sentence cannot exceed 60 days, though it may be aggravated by hard labour.

Before which of these three kinds of tribunals a given case shall be tried is a question, not for the court, but for the public prosecutor to determine. In making his selection he acts under the advice and direction of Crown counsel, and after the facts of the case are or ought to be pretty well known. If, therefore, a case occurs in which a criminal guilty of such offences as those in question receives too light a punishment, this must be due either to error on the part of the prosecutor in bringing the case before a court with inadequate powers, or to error on the part of the judge in not making a sufficient use of the powers with which he is entrusted. That errors of this kind sometimes occur is no more than might be expected, but it would be easy to obviate them by directing that all charges of brutal violence should be tried by jury, and signifying to the judge that a heavier punishment than 60 days is desirable.

I am aware that in England the judge has a discretion in certain cases where he deems it proper to stop a trial and direct the case to go before a tribunal with greater powers. How this works in England I am unable to say, but I should think that it would be repugnant to the general feeling in Scotland, and contrary to all our legal traditions, that after evidence had been led it should be competent to try the case *de novo*. Nor do I think that with all the powers possessed by the public prosecutor such a remedy is at all required, more especially as the evil would be much more effectively met as suggested above. I may further state that I do not think that the people of Scotland would approve, but on the contrary would strongly oppose, any measure by which a single judge sitting without a jury should be empowered to award a heavier punishment than 60 days imprisonment.

2. I am of opinion, under reference to the preceding answer, that all cases of assault with brutal violence should be tried by jury only.

3. I do not think that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by Scottish courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended, but I am strongly of opinion that the alternative of a fine should be declared incompetent.

4, 5. Both these queries relate to an Act of Parliament which is not held to extend to Scotland. I do not, therefore, deem myself qualified from experience to express any opinion on the mode of its working or the efficacy of its provisions in England. I may state, however, as my own conviction, that I do not think the extension of the English Acts authorising flogging would work well in Scotland. I do not believe that the public would sanction the infliction of such a punishment unless under the safeguard of a jury, and I have little doubt that the possible infliction of such a penalty would lead to the escape of many criminals on the verdict of not proven. There is too much reason to fear this from what was observed to occur when capital punishment was more common than at present. Furthermore, it seems to me that the punishment of flogging is open to several grave objections. I fear that any salutary effect it might have as a deterrent would be more than neutralised by its brutalising effects on the popular mind. I do not think that a punishment, which though once common, has been abandoned in most parts of civilised Europe, ought to be re-introduced among the Scotch who, with rare exceptions, are a law-abiding people, and in no respect remarkable for brutality. It must also be considered that there is no absolute security against the condemnation of innocent persons. On the contrary, if we reason from the number of convictions which are annually quashed on appeal, we are driven to a very different conclusion. Now in such cases where imprisonment only has been the punishment, no great harm has been done that cannot be repaired. But a man once flogged would, in Scotland at least, contract an abiding infamy that no effort of an appellate court declaring his innocence could wash out.

I have, &c.

J. W. CLARK.

LANARK (GLASGOW).

Sir,

Sheriff's Chambers, Glasgow, December, 1874.

I have the honour to make the following replies to Mr. Secretary Cross's queries in regard to the more effectual repression of crimes of violence.

1. In Scotland I think that no alteration in the penal law relating to such assaults is required. Much may be done to repress them in the administration of the existing law, especially by the public prosecutor in his selection of the court before which such crimes are to be tried.

2. This question does not in terms apply to Scotland. I think the proper exercise of the discretion reposed in the public prosecutor in regard to the trial of cases summarily or with a jury, is sufficient to attain the end desired without any change in the law. I consider the suggestion made by a high authority, that inferior judges should have it in their power to order cases summarily tried before them to be retried by a tribunal having power to inflict a more severe punishment, to be not only inexpedient where there is a public prosecutor, but to be contrary to the established principles of our criminal jurisprudence.

3. I am not in favour of any large and general extension of the powers of courts of summary jurisdiction in regard to punishment, although I should not be opposed to some extension of the power of the sheriff court in its summary jurisdiction, as, for instance, to sentences of four months imprisonment with or without hard labour.

4. I believe that flogging may, in a few cases, have a powerful effect in preventing crime. In many, perhaps in most, cases, however, it is likely to be injurious to the recipient, not to speak of its demoralising effect on the public which knows of it and encourages its infliction. I think that, this being so, the responsibility of imposing it as a punishment is one which few judges in Scotland would like to undertake, and which very few, even trained judges, are fitted to exercise.

In any event, I am strongly of opinion that flogging should be allowed only where a verdict of guilty has been unanimously returned by a jury, because there is always a possibility of innocent persons being convicted, and in such cases flogging inflicts an irrevocable and disgraceful wrong.

5. The Act referred to does not apply to Scotland.

I am, &c.

W. GUTHRIE,

Sheriff Substitute of Lanarkshire.

MIDLOTHIAN.

Sir,

Edinburgh, November 10, 1874.

In reply to your letter of 15th October last, transmitted to me (on 28th October last) by the Crown Agent of Scotland, I have now the honour to send the following answers to the five questions stated in that letter:—

Question 1. The High Court and circuit courts of judicary have the power of inflicting sentences of long imprisonment or penal servitude for assaults of all kinds, and sheriffs trying assaults in sheriff courts with a jury have the power of inflicting sentences of long imprisonment. In practice a longer sentence of imprisonment than for two years has not been inflicted. The severity of the sentences inflicted by these courts is regulated by the discretion of the court, according to the character and circumstances of each case.

Previous to the Act 25 Vict. c. 18. s. 2, which provides that "in Scotland no offender above 16 years of age shall be whipped for theft or for crime committed against the person or property," these courts had also the power of inflicting corporal punishment by whipping either as the sole punishment or in addition to fine and imprisonment, or either of them. I am not aware that the punishment of whipping has been inflicted on any adult in Scotland since the year 1831. I am of opinion that the words above quoted of the Act 25 Vict. c. 18. s. 2. should be repealed. (See answer to question 4.)

I am also of opinion that sheriffs trying with a jury aggravated cases of assault, especially when further aggravated by previous convictions of assault, should have the power of inflicting a sentence of penal servitude.

2. I am of opinion that there is no necessity for any change in the law. But in practice, cases of assault, aggravated either in their own character or in respect of previous convictions, are sometimes tried summarily in the sheriff courts, and more especially in police and burgh courts, which ought to be tried before the sheriff with a jury. This error in practice may be amended without any new enactment, by the mere regulation of the Lord Advocate.

3. No. Aggravated assaults should be tried with a jury, and then adequate sentences can be inflicted.

4. I am of opinion that the power of flogging should be given in all cases of very aggravated violence committed by males. In addition to the kinds of violence provided for in the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. it should extend to very violent assaults (whether of an indecent kind or not) on women and children, and to very aggravated assaults on men—such as “kicking” in the savage manner so common of late, especially in England.

But I think that in practice the power should be used in cases of very atrocious violence only, though I do not think it would be necessary or advisable to limit its use by a statutory enumeration of the precise cases in which it should be used.

The power should be given to the Court of Justiciary and to the sheriff with a jury only, and to no other court.

I believe that the power of inflicting this punishment will have the effect of putting an end to, or diminishing the number of, crimes of great personal violence which are so common, and are increasing.

5. The 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. does not apply to Scotland.

I am, &c.

ARCH. DAVIDSON,
Sheriff of Midlothian.

MIDLOTHIAN AND HADDINGTON.

Sir,

Edinburgh, November 30, 1874.

I beg to subjoin, for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, my answers to the questions contained in your circular letter of 15th October last.

I am, &c.

HUBERT HAMILTON,
Sheriff Substitute of
Midlothian and Haddington.

1. Apart from the question as to the expediency of authorising flogging, the penalties which our courts can impose for assaults of the class here described seem to me to be sufficiently stringent; but I have no doubt that in practice such offences are often too leniently dealt with, especially by the unpaid magistrates, who, as a rule, preside in the police courts of our larger towns.

2. In Scotland assaults may be summarily tried either,—(1), by police magistrates (unless their jurisdiction is excluded by statute), or (2), by the sheriff. I do not think that the summary jurisdiction of the sheriff should be curtailed. On the contrary, I think it should be extended. (*See answer to next question.*) But I would suggest that aggravated cases of wife-beating, and indeed, all brutal assaults (those, for instance, by kicking or trampling upon the person), should no longer be tried, as is often the case, before police magistrates, but should, in the discretion of the prosecutor (who ought to be placed under the control of the Lord Advocate), and upon a motion by him to that effect, be remitted to a higher court.

3. I see no reason why the sheriff in his summary court should not have the same power of punishing assaults in general, as is conferred upon him by the Prevention of Crimes Act (34 & 35 Vict. c. 112.) in the case of assaults upon police constables. It follows from what I have already said, that I would not similarly enlarge the powers of police magistrates.

4. I am very strongly opposed to the flogging of wife-beaters, 1, because I dread the consequences to a wife when her husband returns home after undergoing so degrading a

punishment; and 2, because the powers which the criminal courts at present have seem to me sufficient, if rigidly exercised, to check any epidemic of wife-beating that may exist throughout the county. In the case of brutal assaults upon children or upon women other than the assaulter's wife, the former objection does not, of course, apply, and in any case, I think, that the provisions of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. should be extended to Scotland.

5. Having had no experience of the working of the Act referred to (which does not apply to Scotland) I am unable to answer this question.

MIDLOTHIAN.

Sir, Edinburgh, December 5, 1874.

In reply to the schedule of five questions submitted by the Home Office to those engaged in the administration of justice by the circular of 15th Oct. 1874, I beg to submit the following answers.

1. In my opinion the penal law of Scotland against assaults of brutal violence is sufficiently stringent. If offenders chargeable with such assaults have occasionally appeared to escape with too lenient treatment, this has arisen from error of judgment on the part of the prosecution in bringing the charge before a police court, or in the summary court of the sheriff, where the power of punishment is restricted.

2. I do not think it desirable that any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, should be declared triable only by the Courts of Justiciary or before a sheriff and jury. I think the discrimination of the procurators fiscal in the police courts, and of the procurators fiscal of the sheriff courts, controlled as it is by the supervision of the Lord Advocate and his deputes, may be safely left to determine whether such offences should be tried summarily or before superior courts.

3. I do not think that it would be desirable to entrust an unpaid and unprofessional magistracy with larger powers of fine or imprisonment than they at present possess. But I think that the sheriffs and their substitutes in their summary courts might be safely entrusted with larger powers of punishment than they at present possess. At present the maximum fine which can be imposed in summary courts is 10*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment is 60 days. I should recommend the raising of the maximum fine to 20*l.*, and the maximum term of imprisonment to six months.

4 and 5. The flogging of adults is altogether unknown in the administration of penal law in Scotland. I have no personal experience as to how far that punishment is introduced into England by 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. has been efficacious in putting down the offences to which it is made applicable. But if it has operated beneficially in England, there seems no reason why it should not be extended to Scotland. I am decidedly of opinion that flogging should not be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the above statute, and certainly not in cases of assaults on women and children. The assaults punished with flogging in England are always more or less premeditated, and generally committed by professional criminals. Assaults on women and children, as a rule, are in no way premeditated, but result from sudden paroxysms of passion, arising frequently out of the miserable conditions of the social life of the lowest classes, and the offender is usually more or less under the influence of drink. While such unfavourable conditions and degraded habits continue I doubt whether flogging would materially deter men from committing such assaults. I fear that the consciousness that such a punishment had been incurred might incite the culprit to carry his violence the length of murder, and it is difficult to conceive the horror of domestic life which would follow the return of a husband or father to a wife or children, for violence towards whom he had been flogged. I think too, that to familiarize the people with the punishment of the lash would tend still further to deepen the degradation into which a considerable portion of the lowest class of the population of our large towns has already sunk.

I am, &c.

JAMES CAMPBELL,
Sheriff Substitute of Midlothian.

MIDLOTHIAN AND HADDINGTON.

Sir,

Sheriff Court House, Edinburgh, November 11, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your circular dated 15th October last, and to submit the following as my answers to the queries contained therein:—

1. I think our law sufficiently stringent for the purpose mentioned in the query provided the statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. be extended to Scotland, and subject to my answer (as under) to the fourth query.

2. A sheriff or sheriff substitute sitting in his summary court without a jury cannot inflict a punishment exceeding 60 days with hard labour, except in special cases provided for by statute. My answer would convert the case as put by the query. I think there are many cases now tried by sheriff and jury which ought to be tried by the sheriff in his summary court. For this purpose I would increase the power of the sheriff sitting in that court to the effect of enabling him to pronounce an imprisonment of six months with hard labour. As the matter now stands the sheriff in that court can under the provisions of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871 punish with six months and nine months hard labour, anyone convicted of beating a constable, while his powers are limited to two months in a cases of wife-beating. Many such cases escape their due retribution in consequence of the limitation of power to which I have just now referred.

3. My answer to this query has already been given by anticipation. If power of six months imprisonment be given to the summary court I think the maximum fine ought to be raised from 10*l.* to 50*l.*

4. I think that power should be given to flog for an aggravated case of wife-beating. I would not entrust other than stipendiary police magistrates with that power but I would not consent to a change of the law in this direction at all without the following proviso, which I insist upon as essential, viz., that when such a sentence is pronounced against a wife-beater, it should be made competent to the wife, if she saw fit, to obtain (upon the ground of such a sentence having been pronounced) a decree of separation and aliment against her husband in the sheriff's civil court. This would entitle her if she chose, to live separately from her husband and at his expense so far as needful, from and after the date of any such sentence recorded and executed against him. I own that without such a proviso I would look with great dread upon the return home, even after an interval of months, of a husband who, upon his wife's information and evidence, had been made to suffer so severe and so degrading a punishment.

5. I understand that the statute referred to does not apply to Scotland.

I am, &c.

FREDERICK M. MANLY,

One of the Substitutes of the Sheriff of
Midlothian and Haddington.

NAIRN.

Sir,

Nairn, November 7, 1874.

I had the honour of receiving your circular of the 15th ult., for the purpose of ascertaining the views of those engaged in the administration of justice with reference to the points raised in the questions contained in your communication.

I have carefully considered these questions, five in number, and although I have for 51 years officiated as sheriff substitute of Nairnshire, yet as it is one of the smallest counties in Scotland, and as crimes of violence have not been numerous, or, except in rare instances, of at all a serious kind within its bounds, I feel that my experience is too limited to enable me to express any judgment so strong as I might venture to do under different circumstances.

In so far as my experience in this county, and my observation of what takes place elsewhere, permit me to form an opinion on the several points of inquiry, I consider that the existing laws applicable to Scotland with respect to all assaults and offences embraced in those points are perfectly sufficient, and that no alteration of those laws is necessary or desirable. At present I think that the flogging of adults in Scotland is uncalled for, and would be most inexpedient. I think that imprisonment, when awarded for assaults of more than a merely trivial kind, should be carried out with much greater rigour on the part of the prison authorities than is now the rule.

I would only further beg leave to add, that it is my full conviction that, with few exceptions, all the cases of assault that occur in Scotland, arise from drink got in the public-houses under which the country groans. Such has been my constant experience. With the increased means of the people for purchasing drink there can be no reformation, and crimes of violence must multiply in number and become more aggravated, unless and until the existing temptations to intoxication be taken away. In Nairnshire the number of licensed houses which I recollect in the rural parts was about 15. They are now only three, and the reduction of the number, gradually made to one-third of what it had been, was at every step followed by an immediate diminution of crime as satisfactory as it was remarkable.

I have, &c.

ALEX. FALCONAR,
Sheriff Substitute of Nairnshire.

PEEBLES.

Sir, Peebles, December 11, 1874.
I received on the 30th October your letter relative to the punishment of aggravated assaults.

In answer to the questions enclosed in that letter, I beg to state for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, that having been favoured with a sight of the answers given by the sheriffs of Scotland to these questions, I concur in these answers, and I beg that they may be held as my replies to the questions referred to.

I have, &c.

T. H. ORPHOOT.

PERTH.

Sir, Perth Court House, November 2, 1874.

As requested by the Crown Agent (Edinburgh) I respectfully submit the following answers to your queries (of date 15th October), founded as these answers are on my magisterial experience of nearly half a century.

1. The penal law of Scotland appears to me amply sufficient to reach all assaults of every degree if properly administered. Under the summary jurisdiction of sheriffs and police magistrates (with some exceptions) fines cannot exceed 10*l.*, and imprisonment (with or without hard labour) 60 days. These sentences are wholly inadequate as punishments of aggravated assaults. Sheriffs, with the aid of a jury, on conviction may increase the imprisonment to two years—a very rare occurrence. The judiciary judges sitting in Edinburgh or on circuits only once in six months, can inflict penal servitude as a sentence. This power given to quarter sessions in England, is withheld from sheriffs in Scotland. All cases of aggravated assaults are reported to town councils in Edinburgh by the fiscals. The depute-advocates (who change their circuits every six months) order these cases either to be tried summarily by sheriffs, or with the aid of a jury, or retain them for trial at circuit. This law depends much on the distance or nearness of the time of circuit. This practice leads to very diverse results, such as cases of less aggravation being tried in the higher courts, and those of deeper guilt sent to the sheriffs to try with jury, or sometimes even summarily. This leads to much apparent disconformity of practice, and gives the idea of caprice, and consequently often affords occasion for animadversion in the press and otherwise. The extension of power to sheriffs trying with jury to impose penal servitude sentences would be productive of much benefit, as assuring speedy and adequate punishment for aggravated offences.

2. The quarter sessions in Scotland have no criminal jurisdiction. This is vested in the sheriffs, but without power to sentence to penal servitude, though still having in certain cases power to pass capital sentences, though none such has been given this century. No aggravated assaults should be tried summarily.

3. It is not desirable that summary jurisdiction should be extended, especially in police courts of justices or burgh magistrates. These being untrained to the law and officiating occasionally causes a distressing and often a ridiculous variation of punishments for similar offences, which not unfrequently excite popular indignation.

4 and 5. The Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., being an extension of the statutes 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. s. 100, applicable only to England and Ireland, has not been held to extend to Scotland, therefore a Scotch magistrate is unable to answer these queries. I may, however, add that the Acts authorising juvenile flogging has never as yet been acted on in this country. I have not unfrequently had criminals before me where I observed that such corporal punishment had been inflicted on them in other jurisdictions, and as it was thus shown without the expected beneficial results. I speak with much caution on the subject, but I venture to doubt whether flogging can generally be found deterrent either to the culprit or the criminal classes. It seems to me to tend to brutalize the recipient, and to sink him lower in the scale of humanity, and rather to exasperate and provoke to vengeance. It has long been my conviction that short imprisonments are worse than futile, and that long periods of imprisonment, where the criminal may be taught profitable industry, and receive a sound moral education, founded on religion, can only be of any permanent avail in the repression of crime.

I am, &c.

HUGH BARCLAY.

DUNBLANE.

Sir,

Court House, Dunblane, November 3, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter of the 15th October in reference to the repression of certain crimes of violence; and in reply to the questions therein put I beg to answer.

1. That it appears to me that the penal law against the assaults of brutal violence referred to is in Scotland sufficiently stringent. Under the Scottish system of criminal prosecutions there is no definite line marking off certain classes of assault as necessarily to be tried in the inferior courts, and any case of assault which would not be adequately met by the punishment competent to an inferior court may be tried at the high court of justiciary or at the assize court, where the judges may pronounce any sentence they think proper upon the offences in question, short of that of capital punishment.

2. I am not of opinion that there are in Scotland any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. I am not of opinion that it is desirable that the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction should be extended.

4. I am not of opinion that flogging should be authorised for other kinds of violence than those within the provisions of the 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., especially in cases of assaults on women and children. It appears to me that the extension of the punishment of flogging generally to cases of assault on women and children would be dangerous, and and liable to abuse. It seems to me to be impossible distinctly to define the cases of assault in which such a punishment would be proper, and to give a general discretion to judges and magistrates in such cases would probably lead to the infliction of the punishment in cases to which it ought not to be applied. The punishment of flogging is only suitable in very exceptional cases, and if not strictly confined to these would be cruel, and therefore in the end ineffective.

5. There have been no cases in this district of Scotland in which the punishment of flogging has been inflicted under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

JOHN GRAHAME.

RENFREW AND BUTE.

Sir,

Rothsay, November 9, 1874.

The Crown agent has forwarded to me your circular letter of date 15th October 1874, requesting my observations and opinion on certain interrogations therein contained; these I have now the honour of submitting in answers numerically corresponding with each interrogatory.

1. Few cases of assault of the nature here referred to have occurred in the county of Bute during (13 years) my official connexion therewith. The penal law thereanent is quoad that county sufficiently stringent.

2. Assaults by husbands upon their wives are frequent. After two convictions it might, I think, have a beneficial tendency were it known that the offender would thereafter be dealt with either before the sheriff and jury or the Justiciary Court.

3. The discretionary power vested in the procurator fiscal, as to what and when cases should be summarily disposed of when wisely exercised (as I have always found it in this county) renders any change in the maximum fine or maximum term of imprisonment for assaults by courts of summary jurisdiction unnecessary.

4. The statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. is not in operation in Scotland. The number of assaults on women and children might be diminished, I believe, if such, at least when accompanied with brutal violence, were dealt with similarly as those cases provided for by that statute.

5. From my observation of the working of this statute, as reported in the public prints, I am of opinion that its provisions might with advantage be extended to Scotland.

I am, &c.

ROBERT ORR,

Sheriff Substitute of Renfrew and Bute.

RENFREW (PAISLEY).

Sir, County Buildings, Paisley, November 17, 1874.

In reply to your letter of October 15, forwarded to me through the Crown agent on 29th October, and which I regret that having been very much occupied I have not been able sooner to reply to, I beg to state that I have carefully considered the questions sent by you on the part of the Secretary of State for the Home Department for consideration and submit the following answers:—

1. It appears to me that there is a limited class of cases in which the law as it at present stands is not sufficiently stringent. I allude to cases of brutal violence where lethal weapons have been used, or where, as in garotte robberies, resistance has been overcome by choking or strangulation. In these exceptional cases it appears to me that the provisions enacted by the statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. for England and Ireland should be extended to Scotland. In other respects I consider the law as it at present stands quite adequate to repress crime.

2. It does not appear to me that there are. Under the present administration of the law in Scotland, all cases such as I have referred to in the preceding answer would be tried by Her Majesty's judges, either on circuit or in the High Court of Justiciary.

3. I do not think so.

4. I think not. Much has been lately said as to the desirability of repressing the crime of wife beating by the use of the lash. My opinion is against this. I do not think that it would be at all effectual in these cases as a deterrent. One of two results would inevitably follow. Either the wife must, after such a punishment has on her account been inflicted on the husband, live separate from him, and you destroy the family relationship; or, should they come together again and a fresh quarrel arise, the husband, smarting under the remembrance of the former punishment, would be led to a greater crime, and murder would ensue. There may, indeed, be very aggravated cases of assault by a husband on his wife in which lethal weapons are resorted to, but these would be dealt with under the statute recommended in my answer to the first question without the necessity of a special provision.

5. I believe it has. It is a punishment which should only be resorted to in very extreme cases. It acts entirely as a deterrent, and being in my opinion, except in the case of very youthful offenders, hopeless as a means of reformation, I do not consider that it should be applied except to the case of abandoned criminals.

I have, &c.

HUGH COWAN.

RENFREW.

Sir,

Sheriffs Chambers, Greenock, November 10, 1874.

In compliance with a request sent to me from the Crown Office in Edinburgh, I have the honour to address you on the subject of the circular letter, dated 15th October 1874, signed by Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, and addressed to the judges, sheriffs, and sheriff substitutes in Scotland.

Before making any answer to the questions put in the circular, it is proper to premise that my experience does not extend beyond a year, and that therefore my opinions are entitled to very little weight.

1. I think that, unless the experiment of flogging for assaults of brutal violence ought to be tried, no amendment of the penal law against such assaults is required. I do not think that a mere extension of the time of the imprisonment to be awarded would have any salutary effect.

2. I think this question should be answered in the negative.

3. I think the maximum term of imprisonment which may be imposed by sheriffs without juries might be extended with advantage to the public. At present that term is limited to 60 days, and I think if it were extended to six months it would relieve juries greatly without any risk of injury to the public service.

4. I think, though with great hesitation, that the experiment of flogging ought to be tried in cases of brutal assaults on women, children, or old or infirm persons.

I regret to say that such assaults seem to be on the increase in this country.

5. I have had no experience by which I can judge of the effect of flogging as a punishment.

I have, &c.

HARRY SMITH,

Sheriff Substitute of Renfrewshire at Greenock.

ROSS AND CROMARTY.

Sir,

Dingwall, November 7, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of a copy of your circular letter dated 15th October 1874, addressed to each of the judges of the Court of Justiciary, and to each of the sheriffs and sheriffs substitutes in Scotland, and I beg now to reply as follows to the several questions therein contained:—

1. I think that the penal law against assaults of the kind specified in this question is sufficiently stringent.

2. I do not think there are any.

3. As the procurators fiscal throughout the country report to Crown counsel any cases that seem to be at all serious, and as only those of a comparatively trifling character are tried summarily, those of a more serious complexion being always ordered to be tried by jury, I do not think there is any reason for extending the maximum fine or the maximum term of imprisonment which may at present be imposed in cases tried summarily.

4. I think that flogging ought to be authorised in cases of assaults on women and children.

5. I am unable to give an opinion on the point raised in this question, as flogging has never been administered within my jurisdiction.

I am, &c.

CRAWFURD HILL,

Sheriff Substitute of Ross and Cromarty.

ROSS.

Sir,

Tain, Scotland, November 3, 1874.

In reply to your circular letter of the 15th ultimo, I beg to say for Mr. Cross's information that the amount of crime in my jurisdiction being small, my experience does

not suggest any change in the law as required for the suppression of crimes of violence, unless that the power to order flogging may be desirable where a man has been repeatedly convicted of assaulting the same woman.

I am, &c.

H. M. TAYLOR,
Sheriff Substitute.

ROSS-SHIRE.

Sir,

Stornoway, November 7, 1874.

I beg leave to subjoin the following statement of my views with reference to the points raised in the questions contained in the circular letter dated "Whitehall, October 15th, 1874," forwarded to me by the Crown Agent in Edinburgh:—

1. The penal law of Scotland against the assaults forming the subject of this question is, in my opinion, sufficiently stringent, and does not require amendment.
2. No (*i.e.*, in Scotland).
3. No (*i.e.*, in Scotland).
4. In the case of assaults by stabbing or kicking, flogging ought, in my opinion, to be authorised.
5. I believe it has, judging from reports of the state of crime in the country generally.

I am, &c.

CHARLES GREY SPITTAL,
Sheriff Substitute of the Lewis District
of Ross-shire.

SELKIRK.

Sir,

Sheriff Court House, Selkirk, January 11, 1875.

In reply to the queries contained in the circular letter of 25th October 1874, I beg to submit for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross,—

1. That in my opinion the penal law against assaults of brutal violence, as distinguished from trifling assaults on the one hand, and indecent assaults on the other, is sufficiently stringent if duly administered; but to ensure the due administration of the law I would suggest that when a person charged with assault, or indeed any offence, has been committed by the sheriff for trial upon a consideration of the precognitions laid before him by the procurator fiscal, it should be made imperative that the accused should be brought to trial, which is not the case at present, and also that previous convictions should in every case be libelled, leaving it to the court to determine what weight to attach to them.

2. Assaults aggravated by two previous convictions ought not to be tried summarily; unless—

3. The maximum fine and the maximum term of imprisonment which courts of summary jurisdiction may impose should be greatly extended. This is very desirable, and I am of opinion that the sheriff's summary jurisdiction should be extended in accordance with section 12 of "The Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871" (34 & 35 Vict. c. 112.).

4. Flogging should be authorised for assaults on women and children, but only in cases of brutal violence. The power of passing such sentence should be confined to the high court of justiciary and to the sheriff courts. To prevent undue severity the Home Secretary should be empowered, on cause shown, to commute flogging for hard labour or a further period of imprisonment.

Where the sentence of flogging has been carried into effect in the case of an assault by a man upon his wife, the wife ought to be thereby entitled to decree of divorce, and every facility should be given her to enable her to obtain this.

I am, &c.

J. W. S. MILNE,
Sheriff Substitute of Selkirkshire.

ORKNEY.

ANSWERS.

1. I am humbly of opinion that it is not, and that it should be amended by giving power to flog.

2. None; at least none in Scotland.
3. I think that the maximum fine and maximum term of imprisonment should be extended; but only in the sheriff courts in Scotland.
4. I think decidedly that it should.
5. It has.

JAMES ROBERTSON,
Sheriff Substitute of Orkney.

SHETLAND.

Sir,

Lerwick, Shetland, November 9, 1874.

In answer to the queries contained in Sir H. S. Ibbetson's circular of the 15th ultimo, in regard to the more effectual repression of crimes attended with violence, I have to report that—

1. During nine years past, in which I have administered justice in Shetland, few assaults attended with brutal violence have been brought before me. At the same time, as the Shetlanders are occupied generally as sailors, spending only their winters at home, and getting corrupted in the seaport towns of Britain, assaults of a somewhat serious nature, and now and then attended with kicking or the use of a knife, are on the increase. I am, however, of opinion that the use of the lash in assaults of brutal violence should be authorised, but only after one previous conviction at least has been recorded against the offender. The matter is one of great delicacy in the case of a husband convicted on the wife's evidence of assaulting her, and condemned to be whipped. She could not expect to live in any happiness with him in future. Therefore, administering it in such instances should be limited to cases of savage cruelty and cowardice.

2. In Scotland the Lord Advocate and his deputed decide, in all cases (except police offences), whether they should be tried summarily by the sheriff, or by a sheriff and jury, or by the High Court of Justiciary. It would probably neither be wise, nor very possible, to interfere with their discretion by legislative enactment, but certainly extraordinary cases of brutality should be tried only by jury, and the judge should have the option of adding whipping to imprisonment.

In Shetland, from the great expense of having a trial in Edinburgh, cases are ordered to be tried before the resident sheriff, which elsewhere would be taken to the Circuit Court of Justiciary. It is important that the sheriff should have the right to try the crime of robbery, at present one of the pleas of the Crown, and for that crime and also for cattle and sheep stealing, to have the power to inflict a sentence of penal servitude. Cases of robbery have been ordered to be tried here by the sheriff as simple thefts.

3. I am of opinion that in Scotland a trial by jury should precede a longer term of imprisonment than 60 days. At least the power of inflicting a longer period after summary trial should be limited to sheriffs, and not extended to unpaid police magistrates.

4 and 5. The Statute quoted applies only to crime in England. Above, I have stated my views as to extraordinary cases of brutal assaults on women.

I have, &c.

ANDREW MURE,
Sheriff Substitute, Lerwick.

STIRLING.

Sir,

Stirling, November 2, 1874.

I have been favoured through the Crown Agent for Scotland, with Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson's circular of the 15th October, regarding the measures to be adopted for the more effectual suppression of crimes of violence, and I beg to submit the following answers to the questions in the circular :—

1. I consider that flogging might be enacted as a punishment which the judges of the High Court and Circuit Court of Justiciary might be specially authorised to impose in assaults of brutal violence, meaning thereby to the danger of life, or by maiming, and that in addition to the crimes set forth in the statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. That statute does not extend to Scotland, and although the courts of justiciary might, as it seems to me, impose the punishment of flogging under their common law powers, still, as they have

not been in use for some years to impose it, there would be advantage in giving them special powers by statute, if for no other reason than to assimilate the laws of the United Kingdom on the subject.

2. I do not know that there are any kinds of assault which may now be summarily punished, which should be declared triable only at assizes and quarter sessions.

3. It seems to me that the maximum fine of 10*l.* and the maximum term of imprisonment of 60 days, which may be imposed in sheriff courts in Scotland, under their summary jurisdiction, might rightly be extended to 10*l.* fine, and six months imprisonment by these courts.

4 and 5. As already stated, the statute 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. does not extend to Scotland, and I cannot speak to its efficacy. I have stated that flogging might be specially enacted as a punishment for assaults of brutal violence, that is, to the danger of life, or by maiming, as well as for the crimes of the statute 26 & 27 Vict., which could be inflicted by the courts of justiciary, but I do not think it should be extended to all assaults on women and children. If brutal, then the general provision would be sufficient. If not brutal, flogging should not, in my opinion, be inflicted. I consider that the punishment to flogging should only be imposed by the courts of justiciary in Scotland, except, indeed, by the inferior courts under the provisions of the existing statutes as to juvenile offenders.

I have, &c.

ROBERT SCONCEY,
Sheriff Substitute.

DUMBARTON.

Sir,

Belmont, Falkirk, N.B., November 2, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular letter of the 15th October in reference to "the measures to be adopted for the more effectual repression of "the crimes of violence," and I have the honour respectfully to submit for your consideration the annexed replies to the questions contained in your letter.

I have, &c.

ROBERT BELL,
Sheriff Substitute of Stirling and
Dumbarton at Falkirk.

Answers to the Questions contained in Mr. Secretary Cross's circular letter of 15th October 1874.

I. Punishment by whipping had, as regards adult offenders in Scotland, almost fallen into desuetude, when the Act 25 Vict. c. 18. s. 2. expressly provided that "in Scotland "no offender above 16 years of age shall be whipped for theft or for crime committed "against person or property."

I understand also that the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44. does not extend to Scotland.

In these circumstances I am of opinion that in all cases of assault involving brutal violence, as well as in cases similar to those which in England fall within the provisions of the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44., the court in Scotland, when the trial is by jury, should be authorised, in addition to any other punishment competently awarded, to direct the infliction of whipping in accordance with the terms of the provisions of the said Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

II. I answer this question in the negative.

III. I think that it is desirable that the maximum fine should be extended to 20*l.* and that the maximum term of imprisonment should be extended to six months in cases tried summarily in the sheriff court; provided that, in all cases, if required by either party to do so, it should be imperative on the judge to keep a note of the evidence and of objections and answers.

IV. This question has been answered under head 1st.

V. This Act does not apply to Scotland, and I have had no judicial experience of its effects.

ROBERT BELL,
Sheriff Substitute of Stirling and Dumbarton
at Falkirk.

Circular (No. 2) addressed to—

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS.
COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF CITY OF LONDON,
and
CHIEF CONSTABLES OF COUNTIES (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Sir,

Whitehall, October 15, 1874.

Mr. Secretary Cross is desirous of obtaining information as to the prevalence of what may be termed brutal assaults, as distinguished on the one hand from trifling assaults, and on the other from indecent assaults; and he will be much obliged if you will furnish him with answers to the following questions:—

1. What is the number of convictions for brutal assaults as above described which have taken place in your district in each of the last five years, distinguishing summary convictions from convictions on indictment, and convictions for assaults on women and children from conviction for assaults on men, the return to be made in the Form enclosed?

If you are unable to give the return above asked for, can you state whether there has been in your district during the last five years, and particularly during the last year, any marked increase in the number of convictions for brutal assaults as above described? If so, has this increase shown itself in the number of summary convictions or in the number of convictions on indictment, or in both? Again, has it shown itself in the number of convictions for assaults on women and children, or in the number of convictions for other brutal assaults, or in both? The result to be stated as far as possible in figures.

2. Has there been any increase in brutal assaults, or in any class of them, and, if so, to what do you consider that such increase is attributable?
3. What remedy do you suggest for the purpose of diminishing these offences?
4. Has the offence of garotting practically ceased in your district, and, if so, do you think that the result is to be attributed to the punishment of flogging authorised by the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I am,

Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON.

ANSWERS TO CIRCULAR No. 2.

From Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis.

Sir, 4, Whitehall Place, January 22, 1875.

I have the honour to transmit herewith for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross a return of convictions for brutal assaults within the Metropolitan Police District during the last five years, as registered in your letter of 14th January.

No record has been kept distinguishing "brutal" from common assaults, but the figures in the return may be taken as approximately correct, the police in preparing them having been guided by the severity of the sentences and the memory of the officers concerned in the cases.

The assaults on women and children show a steady and continuous increase from 280 in 1870 to 351 in 1874.

The assaults on men appear to have fluctuated, having been only 316 in 1873 as against 369 in 1870, though they increased to 391 in 1874.

The causes to which the prevalence of this class of offence are to be ascribed appear to be—

1. Intoxication consequent, to some extent, on increased earnings.
2. The wretched dwellings of the poorer classes and the absence of any provision for their comfort and amusement.

The more experienced officers of the Metropolitan Police advocate as a rule longer sentences of imprisonment and the infliction of corporal punishment, especially in the cases of brutal assaults on women and children.

I believe that the punishment of flogging if awarded after a trial by jury would to a certain extent act as a deterrent. A permanent improvement must be sought for in the moral influences brought to bear upon the lower classes (to whom these crimes are almost entirely confined) by improved education, decent dwellings, and consequent habits of order and thrift.

The offence known as garotting has practically ceased. The opinion of the police appears to be that corporal punishment has tended very much to assist them in the suppression of this class of offence. There seems, however, some reason to believe that this peculiar offence was confined to a very limited class of persons.

I have, &c.

G. N. W. HENDERSON.

From Commissioner of Police of the City of London.

Sir, 26, Old Jewry, January 22, 1875.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your printed letter marked "immediate" of the 14th instant, and to transmit herewith, for the information of the Secretary of State, a return, as required, of the number of convictions for brutal assaults within the city of London in each of the last five years.

As the return shows, there has been no increase during that period in these assaults, but on the contrary they have diminished in number, and I am of opinion that they would still further decrease were the persons who commit them liable on conviction to corporal punishment.

The offence of garotting has never been common in the city, and since the passing of the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44, there has been no case of it, which may possibly be attributable to the fact that the punishment of flogging for garotting was authorised by that statute.

I have, &c.

JAMES FRASER, Colonel,
Commissioner of Police.

From Chief Constables of Counties.

COUNTY OF BEDFORD.

Sir, County Police Office, Bedford, November 2, 1874.

In compliance with your letter of the 15th instant, I have the honour to enclose a return of convictions for brutal assaults.

It will be seen from the return that crimes of this description are not very prevalent in this county, and the increase and decrease of these offences during the past five years has not been such as to call for any remark.

As a remedy for diminishing these offences, I should beg to suggest that the punishment of flogging may be authorised, as I feel sure that corporal punishment has a most deterring effect, especially on individuals of a cowardly disposition, such as those are who usually commit brutal assaults on women and children.

I should suggest that if flogging be authorised, that the punishment should be inflicted within the precincts of a gaol, and accompanied by a certain term of imprisonment.

The offence of garrotting has practically ceased in this district, indeed I may say that it never did exist in this county.

I am, &c.

ASHTON C. WARNER,
Chief Constable of Bedfordshire.

COUNTY OF BERKS.

Sir, Chief Constable's Office, Reading, November 10, 1874.

In compliance with your circular letter, dated 15th October 1874, I have the honour to enclose a return of convictions for brutal assaults, and to furnish you with answers to your other three questions, viz.

2. There has not been any increase.
3. Flogging.
4. This offence never existed in the district.

I have, &c.

A. BLANDY,
Chief Constable of Berks.

Sir, Chief Constable's Office, Aylesbury, Nov. 9, 1874.

I have the honour to forward you, in compliance with your circular of the 15th ultimo, a return of brutal assaults committed in this county during the past five years.

With reference to question 4 of the circular, there not having been a case of garrotting in this county, I am unable to say anything on the question of flogging.

I have, &c.

JOHN TYRWHITT DRAKE,
Chief Constable of Bucks.

ISLE OF ELY.

Sir, Chief Constable's Office, March, November 2, 1874.

I have the honour to state in reply to the questions contained in the circular of the 15th Oct. 1874:—

1. According to the return enclosed the number of brutal assaults for five years is 25.
2. There has been an increase, owing in some measure to inadequate punishment.
3. Longer terms of imprisonment and severe corporal punishment in every case, administered soon after conviction and *shortly before* being liberated from goal.
4. There has been but little garrotting ever in this district.

I have, &c.

J. W. FOSTER,
Chief Constable of the Isle of Ely.

COUNTY OF CHESTER.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Chester, Nov. 20, 1874.

I have the honour to enclose herewith a return as called for by Mr. Secretary Cross in letter dated 15th October 1874, and in answer to paragraph No. 2, of said letter,

1. I beg to say that the very slight increase of brutal assaults on women in this county, must I fear be attributed to drunkenness.

3. I suggest as a remedy for these offences, the power of adjudicating flogging in addition to imprisonment, inasmuch as that the parties who commit them are, as a rule, cowards at heart, and would therefore the more be deterred by such punishment.

4. The offence of garrotting no longer exists in Cheshire, and I have no hesitation in saying that the punishment of flogging has, in my opinion, by the terror resulting from it, been the cause of its suppression.

I have, &c.

THOS. JOHNES SMITH,
Chief Constable of Cheshire.

COUNTY OF CORNWALL.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Bodmin, November 5, 1874.

In compliance with your circular dated 15th October 1874, I have the honour to forward for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross the form showing the number of brutal assaults committed in the county of Cornwall, so far as is known to the county constabulary, during the last five years; and to report that this offence is not prevalent in this county: indeed the chairman at the last Quarter Sessions (last month) commented favourably on the few cases that occurred in this county as compared with the number in some counties in England, and I have much pleasure in adding that during the time I have been chief constable (17 years) I have not heard of a case of garrotting in this county.

With respect to what remedy I should suggest for the purpose of diminishing brutal assaults, I should strongly advise flogging in all these cases; and where committed on women or children imprisonment for not less than six months nor more than two years. Should the sentence be for six months the prisoner should during that time be twice flogged, the first flogging to take place the day after his admission to the gaol, and the second at the end of three months.

I have, &c.

W. R. GILBERT, Lieutenant-Colonel,
and Chief Constable of Cornwall.

COUNTY OF DERBY.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, 17, St. Mary's Gate, Derby,
November 21, 1874.

I have the honour to forward you the information asked for in enclosed form relative to brutal assaults committed in the county of Derby during the past five years ended 29th September 1874.

There appears to have been a considerable falling off in the number of these cases up to the end of the year 1872, and from that date a steady increase, more particularly during the past year, both in summary and indictable convictions.

I find that assaults of this nature prevail and have increased in districts where the bulk of the population is composed of colliers and nailors, and that in the rural districts of this county such cases are of rare occurrence.

This fact would seem to me to point to the high rate of wages received by the class of men referred to as one of the sources to which these crimes may be traced.

I am of opinion that corporal punishment would have the desirable effect of diminishing these offences.

The offence of garrotting has practically ceased in this county, and I believe the result to be attributable to the punishment of flogging.

I have, &c.

F. J. PARRY, Chief Constable,
(Late Captain R. M. L. Infantry.)

COUNTY OF DEVON.

Devon Constabulary, Chief Constable's Office, Exeter,
November 7, 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your circular, re the subject of "brutal assaults," I have the honour to forward the enclosed return, which will be the reply to question No. 1.

2. A large proportion of the assaults on men, are savage attacks on police constables while in the execution of their duty.

3. My own opinion, and that, I venture to say, of every experienced police officer, is that corporal punishment, and in certain cases low diet while in prison, are the only punishments which would serve as positive deterrents to this class of crime.

4. I have no recollection or record of a single case of garrotting in this county since the establishment of the county constabulary.

I have, &c.

G. DECOURCY HAMILTON,
Chief Constable of Devon.

COUNTY OF DORSET.

Chief Constable's Office, Dorchester,
November 9, 1874.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose, as requested in your circular of the 15th ultimo, return of convictions for brutal assaults.

The return shows that there has not been an increase in this class of offence in the county of Dorset.

3. I suggest that all cases of brutal assault should be sent for trial at quarter sessions or assizes and that, on conviction, flogging should form part of the sentence. The present punishment of imprisonment only, being quite insufficient to deter brutal persons from committing such assaults.

4. There has not been any case of garrotting reported in this county.

I have, &c.

AMYCETT BROWN,
Chief Constable of Dorset.

COUNTY OF DURHAM.

County Constabulary Office, Durham,
December 3, 1874.

Sir,

In compliance with the terms of your letter of the 15th October, I beg to forward for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, as follows:—

1. A return, as specified in the first paragraph, of the number of convictions for brutal assaults within the jurisdiction of the county constabulary.

It not appearing quite clear whether cases of "unlawfully wounding," &c. (under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. ss. 18, 19, & 20), were intended to be included, these have been given separately in red ink, so as to admit of their exclusion if necessary.

2. There is shown to have been a steady increase in the number of brutal assaults, in proportion to the continued rapid increase of population of a very rough character from all parts of the United Kingdom, attracted by the very high wages, consequent on the great demand for labour in the general development of mines and manufactures throughout the county.

This exceptional state of things has been attended with greatly increased drinking, particularly of ardent spirits, to which, in a great measure, may be attributed the increase in the number of offences recorded in the annexed return.

3. In my opinion, borne out by that of my most experienced subordinates, the best remedy for these evils is a firm administration of the law, by imprisonment, without the option of a fine, in all cases of cowardly or brutal assaults (with or without weapons), kicking when down, &c., &c., and, in extreme cases, corporal punishment in addition.

This last having been found to have a salutary effect after certain assizes where the lash has been administered.

4. The offence of garrotting never prevailed to any extent in this county, and has now practically ceased, which result may fairly be attributed to the terror inspired by the flogging authorised by the prompt enactment of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

GEORGE FR. WHITE, Lieutenant-Colonel,
Chief Constable, County Durham.

COUNTY OF ESSEX, including the Boroughs of HARWICH and
SAFFRON WALDEN.

Chief Constable's Office, Chelmsford,

Nov. 7, 1874.

Sir,

In compliance with the directions contained in your letter dated the 15th October 1874,

I have the honour to forward the return desired, and to report as therein shown that there has not been an increase in Essex, of any class of brutal assaults, and to submit for the purpose of diminishing generally these offences that the assizes and quarter sessions be empowered to award flogging.

There has not been a case of garrotting in Essex.

I have, &c.

J. B. B. McHARDY,
Admiral and Chief Constable of Essex.

COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER.

Chief Constable's Office, Cheltenham,

November 5, 1874.

Sir,

Herewith I beg to forward the return asked for in your letter of the 15th ultimo.

I found it somewhat difficult to define what was meant by a "brutal assault." I considered that the safest way of getting a correct return of these assaults, would be to send in only those cases of assault, when the defendants were sent to gaol without the option of a fine, or were committed for trial.

This has been done in the enclosed return.

I have, &c.

HENRY CHRISTIAN, Captain, R.N.
Chief Constable of Gloucestershire.

1. There has not been an increase of brutal assaults taking the returns of the whole county together.

2. I find, however, that there has been an increase in "brutal assaults" in the forest district since 1871.

I consider that the increase is due to the great increase of wages earned by the mining population, and the shorter hours of labour, which has afforded them greater facilities for drinking, and consequent brutality.

3. I have no hesitation in suggesting the use of the cat for the purpose of diminishing these offences.

4. The offence of garrotting has quite ceased in this district, the result is no doubt due to the punishment of flogging authorised by the Act 26 & 27 Vict. cap. 44.

COUNTY OF HEREFORD.

Sir, Shire Hall, Hereford, November 5, 1874.

I have the honour to forward enclosed return of brutal assaults, and in reply to your questions in circular letter dated October 15, received October 22, I have the honour to report for the information of the Secretary of State,

1. Return enclosed.
2. There has not been any increase in brutal assaults. Of the 12 who were indicted five were concerned in night poaching cases.
3. In all cases of assault other than common I would suggest longer sentences of imprisonment without choice of fine.
4. No cases of garrotting in this county.

I have, &c.

J. A. DRUMMOND TELFER, Capt. R.A.H.P.,
Chief Constable of Hereford.

COUNTY OF HERTFORD.

Sir, Hertford, October 29, 1874.

I have the honour to transmit a return of the number of persons who have been convicted in Hertfordshire of aggravated assaults during the last five years.

Most of those assaults were committed by persons while under the influence of liquor.

There has been no increase in the number of those offences.

There has been no instance of garrotting in this county for many years, nor has the punishment of flogging ever been resorted to.

I have, &c.

A. ROBERTSON,
Chief Constable of Herts.

COUNTIES OF HUNTINGDON AND CAMBRIDGE.

Sir, Cambridge, Nov. 12, 1874.

Herewith I return the tabular report of convictions for brutal assaults during the last five years called for in your circular of the 15th Oct., with answers not contained in figures added thereto, for the counties of Hunts and Cambs.

I am, &c.

GEO. DAVIES,
Vice Admiral and Chief Constable.

HUNTINGDON.

The 1st and 2nd are met as desired, in the above figures.

To the 3rd, I recommend flogging for all brutal assaults.

To the 4th, garrotting is unknown in the county.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

The 1st and 2nd are answered as desired, in the above figures.

To the 3rd, I recommend flogging for all brutal assaults.

To the 4th, garrotting is unknown in the county.

COUNTY OF KENT.

Kent County Constabulary, Chief Constable's Office,
Maidstone, November 2, 1874.

Sir, I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th ulto., in which you state that Mr. Secretary Cross is desirous of obtaining information as to the prevalence of what may be termed brutal assaults, and requesting to be furnished with answers to questions contained therein.

In reply to the first question I beg to forward you a return of convictions for brutal assaults during the years 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874.

Answers to questions 2, 3, and 4, I have given below.

I have, &c.

J. W. HY. BUXTON,
Chief Constable of Kent.

1. The return shows slightly an increase.
I attribute the cause to drunkenness.
3. Flogging and longer terms of imprisonment; powers given to justices to order flogging on summary convictions.
4. The offence of garrotting has not occurred within the chief constable's jurisdiction in Kent, but he agrees that flogging is the only effectual remedy.

COUNTY OF LANCASTER.

Sir, County Police Office, Preston, Nov. 16, 1874.

In compliance with circular bearing date the 15th ultimo, I have the honour to forward a return of what may be termed brutal assaults, that is, of all assaults which have been reported to the police, and for which convictions have been obtained during the last five years, and which may be distinguished, as directed by the circular, on the one hand from trifling assaults, and on the other from indecent assaults.

The figures of the return must however be taken with due consideration for the difficulties which arise in furnishing them, the particular circumstances in many instances being forgotten, and the punishment inflicted being no sure criterion of the nature of the assault; although the assaults enumerated are, so far as can be ascertained, such as could not be classified as trifling, I am of opinion that many of them are not such as could be termed "brutal" in the usual acceptation of the term.

It will be observed by the return that the total number of convictions has increased each year since 1870, but that the increase has shown chiefly in the summary convictions, and to a much more marked extent during the last year; also that it has shown itself less in assaults on women and children than on men.

In addition to the enclosed return of so-called brutal assaults I would submit the following figures:—

	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
Number of persons proceeded against on indictment for "wounding, stabbing," &c., with intent to do bodily harm, "assaults and inflicting bodily harm," "assaults common" and "assaults on police"	65	41	58	65	77
Number of persons proceeded against summarily for "assaults common," "assaults on police," and "assaults aggravated on women and children"	4,634	5,044	5,073	5,090	5,713
Total	4,699	5,085	5,131	5,155	5,790

This total shows the number of persons (except those who did not appear in answer to summons) proceeded against during the last five years for all classes of assaults.

I consider the increase chiefly attributable to the increase of drunkenness, which appears to be sufficiently shown in the subjoined figures:—

	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
Apprehensions for drunkenness - - - -	3,023	3,732	4,654	5,465	6,356
Summonses for drunkenness - - - -	7,533	8,203	8,493	8,204	9,840
Total - - - -	10,556	11,935	13,147	13,669	16,196

As for the means which might be taken to diminish offences of brutal violence I have no doubt that real "cowardly and brutal" assaults, such as brutal assaults upon women and children, indecent assaults upon children of tender years, and assaults by kicking or otherwise upon men who by circumstances are powerless to resist, should be legally classified and defined as "cowardly and brutal," distinct from all other classes of assaults, and be punished by flogging. I should also suggest that the power of magistrates in dealing summarily with aggravated assaults upon women and children should be extended to aggravated assaults upon men.

The offence of garrotting is and always has been almost unknown in this police district.

I have, &c.

ROB. BRUCE.

Chief Constable of Lancashire.

COUNTY OF LEICESTER.

County Constabulary Office, Leicester,

November 11, 1874.

Sir,

In compliance with the instructions contained in your circular dated the 15th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit you the accompanying return of convictions for "brutal assaults," for each of the last five years, which I have directed to be carefully supplied.

I find that I cannot with any degree of accuracy fill up the column under the heading "brutal assaults on men, summary," as such assaults are not distinguished from others in the returns of offences determined summarily.

But I am happy to state that this county during the last five years has not been disgraced by any increase of brutal assaults, or any class of them, which have been so prevalent in other parts of the kingdom, and I say this notwithstanding the return for 1874 is so much above that of 1873, which was an exceptional year, the numbers of 1874 being less than the average number for the five years.

The punishment of flogging in all cases which have been accompanied with brutal violence, whether for garrotting, burglary, or any other crime, has always appeared to me most just and proper upon trial by jury.

The offence of garrotting has practically ceased in this county, which I think is fairly attributable to the punishment of flogging, although I am not aware of any cases which have occurred in this county, where such punishment has been inflicted.

I have, &c.

FREDK. GOODYEAR,

Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF LINCOLN.

Chief Constable's Office, Lincoln,

November 30, 1874.

Sir,

I have herewith the honour to send the return called for by your letter of the 15th October.

In reply to your questions, I have to state that there has not in this county been any increase in the frequency of brutal assaults.

Garrotting is not practised in this county, and indeed, I am not able to say that, in this district, the law on assaults requires revision, or that the punishment should be made more severe; the county is purely agricultural, and quiet and orderly, and except in a small district in the north, without any influx of persons of violent habits.

I have, &c.

PHILIP BICKNEL,
Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF NORFOLK.

County Constabulary Office, Norwich,
November 16, 1874.

Sir, In compliance with the circular letter from the Home Office of the 15th ultimo, I have the honour to transmit a return of convictions for brutal assaults in the county of Norfolk, during the five years ending Sept. 29, 1874, and to state:—

That those assaults have not increased lately, but that from time to time there occurs a very aggravated and brutal assault on women, which offence seems to require some special punishment.

I consider that authority being given to magistrates in petty sessions to award corporal punishment in a gaol or house of correction would have a sanitary effect.

Garrotting is an offence unknown in the county of Norfolk.

I am, &c.

G. BLACK, Lieut.-Colonel,
Chief Constable of Norfolk.

COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON.

County Constabulary Office, Northampton,
November 9, 1874.

Sir, I have the honour to transmit herewith the "returns of convictions for brutal assaults" for the county of Northampton and Liberty of Peterborough as requested in section No. 1 of your communication of 15th October last.

With reference to section No. 2 I beg to say that no increase of brutal assaults or offences of that nature has taken place in this county.

In reply to section No. 3 I strongly recommend flogging in all cases of brutal assaults, particularly where women and children are the victims of such outrages.

Garrotting is, I am happy to say, at present unknown within my jurisdiction.

I have, &c.

H. L. KAYLY,
Chief Constable, County of Northampton, and
of Liberty of Peterborough.

COUNTY OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

Chief Constable's Office, Hexham,
November 5, 1874.

Sir, I have the honour to forward return of convictions for brutal assaults in this county, as requested, and I beg to draw your attention to the increase in the number of cases under the head of "summary" for the year 1874, committed on women and children, which, in my opinion, is attributable to better wages obtained by the working classes generally, shorter hours of labour, and the consequent increase in cases of drunkenness. I confine these remarks to the coal mining and the manufacturing districts exclusively.

There has not been a single case of garrotting in this county since the Act 26 & 27 Vict., cap. 44, authorising flogging as punishment to be awarded in such cases, came into operation.

I have, &c.

MATTHEW TAYLOR,
Dep. Chief Constable of Northumberland.

COUNTY OF NOTTINGHAM.

Chief Constable's Office, County House, Nottingham,
November 18, 1874.

Sir,

I have delayed answering your letter of the 15th October in the hope of being able to give the return asked for, but after calling for a return from each superintendent of a division of the number of brutal assaults during the last five years, I find that I cannot forward one the correctness of which I could vouch for, I therefore think it better not to forward one at all. I have, however, to state that I do not think there has been in the county of Nottingham during the last five years or particularly during the last year any marked increase in the number of convictions for brutal assaults.

As regards a remedy for these brutal assaults I feel convinced that if the punishment of flogging were legal, the offence would almost entirely cease, as has that of garrotting which at one time was prevalent in this county.

I am, &c.

HENRY HOLDEN,
Chief Constable of Notts.

COUNTY OF MONMOUTH.

Chief Constable's Office, Abergavenny,
October 30, 1874.

Sir,

In compliance with your instructions, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying return of so called "brutal assaults." In this return I have included all cases of assault (indecent assaults excepted) in which the persons charged were committed for trial and convicted, or were summarily committed to gaol.

There has been no increase in these assaults. They generally arise through drink.

Considering the prosperous state of the country and the large wages earned, it is only surprising they have not increased. I believe this is due to the Licensing Act of 1872, and that had it not been for this Act, drunkenness and brutal assaults would have been greatly in excess of their present numbers. Any measure which will diminish drunkenness will have the same effect on brutal assaults.

I much doubt if flogging would produce any satisfactory result. There may, however, be exceptional cases of "brutal assaults" on women where a discretionary power of flogging should be vested in some tribunal. I think such power should be confined to the courts of assize or of quarter sessions.

I have, &c.

EDMUND HERBERT,
Chief Constable of the County of Monmouth.

COUNTY OF OXFORD.

I would suggest flogging, as the best remedy, for the purpose of diminishing these offences.

C. M. OWEN,
Chief Constable, Oxon.

COUNTY OF RUTLAND.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Oakham, November 4, 1874.

In submitting the accompanying form "brutal assaults" I have the honour to report that I have made careful inquiries and cannot ascertain that a single case of brutal assault, of such a description as is intended to be included in the said form, has been committed during the last five years, in this county.

I have, &c.

WILLIAM KEEP,
Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF SALOP.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Shrewsbury,
December 3, 1874.

In reply to your circular letter dated 15th October 1874, calling for a return of convictions for brutal assaults,

I have the honour to inform you that after careful inquiry into the records of crimes in this county during the years 1870-74 inclusive, it does not appear that any party has been convicted of a crime of this nature.

The offence of garrotting does not at present exist within my jurisdiction, nor has any case of this kind occurred to the knowledge of the county constabulary within the last five years.

In the copies of my reports to Quarters Sessions dated 26th December 1872, 25th June, and 8th October 1873, forwarded to you, I stated the case of police constable 52, Edward Lloyd, who had been assaulted in the execution of his duty at Wellington, on the 26th June 1872, and died on the 8th June 1873 from the injuries he had received. The assault in this instance I consider was a brutal one.

I am, &c.

R. J. EDGELL, Colonel,
Chief Constable of Shropshire.

COUNTY OF SOMERSET.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Glastonbury,
Nov. 28, 1874.

In compliance with your circular order of the 15th October last, I have the honour to transmit a return showing the number of brutal assaults committed within my jurisdiction in the county of Somerset for the last five years.

On reference to this document you will observe that for the year 1874 there was a considerable decrease in the numbers of this class of offence.

With regard to the remedy upon which you wrote me to express an opinion, I have no hesitation in most strongly recommending that in all cases of brutal assaults it shall be competent for the judge or magistrate trying the case to order that corporal punishment shall be inflicted, as I am perfectly satisfied it will be the means of materially checking, if not preventing, a class of offence which has become a disgrace to the country.

In reply to your fourth query, I have to acquaint you that we have not had a case of garrotting in this county for a very considerable period, and which, I have no doubt, is to be ascribed to the punishment of flogging.

I have, &c.

VAL. GOOLD,
Chief Constable, Somerset.

COUNTY OF HANTS.

Sir,

Hants Constabulary, Winchester, October 28, 1874.

In compliance with your letter of the 15th inst., I have the honour to forward herewith "return of convictions for brutal assaults" in Hampshire in each of the last five years.

Practically there has been no increase in brutal assaults in 1874 over 1870.

I would suggest for the purpose of diminishing these offences corporal punishment.

No offence of garrotting has been committed in Hampshire.

I have, &c.

J. H. MUST,
Chief Constable of Hants.

COUNTY OF STAFFORD.

Chief Constable's Office, Stafford,
October 23, 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your letter dated the 15th inst., received yesterday, I regret much being compelled, after careful consideration, to inform you that it is quite out of my power to furnish the return you call for. A very large part of this county is, as you are aware, densely populated by mining and manufacturing classes, and in many places the cases for trial at petty sessions average from 50 to 100 two and even three days a week.

The records kept of these cases by the police are very brief, namely specifying the character of the charge in technical terms, the penalty, the fees allowed, &c. And in many cases the notes of the justices or of their clerk do not go much further.

Taking then the cases described under the general heading of assault I have really no means of recalling the special circumstances of each case beyond the memory of the policeman (if any) who may have been engaged in it. With such a vast amount of business as we have at many of our sessions, with men constantly joining, leaving or being transferred elsewhere, I feel that I cannot honestly undertake to furnish a numerical return which should be worthy of any consideration. I speak of course only of cases disposed of summarily. As regards those sent for trial at assizes or quarter sessions the recollection of the officers engaged will necessarily be more accurate, and I can doubtless also refer to the depositions which I believe are filed in the clerk of the peace's office.

For the rest I may probably be able to furnish some not unreliable information on the subject generally by obtaining from my superintendents and other superior officers in charge of petty sessional divisions their general impression as to the increase or otherwise of "brutal assaults."

As to the fourth question contained in your letter I do not think that a single case of garrotting, properly so termed, has occurred in the county during the eight years that I have been chief constable, but if you refer to the cases of robbery with violence from the person to which flogging may be awarded I may probably have to furnish a not inconsiderable list.

I have, &c.

W. CONGREVE,
Chief Constable.

Chief Constable's Office, Stafford,
6th November 1874.

Sir,

In reply to your circular, dated 15th October, I have the honour to submit to you a table, giving part only of the information comprised in your form, and that part not absolutely reliable, inasmuch as in some cases I have been compelled to take averages, and in all I have had to trust to the memory of the officer engaged in the case as to the degree of brutality and cruelty exhibited.

I have found that the cases proceeded against by indictment bear a very insignificant proportion to the total, some $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., so far as I have been able to distinguish.

The chief officers of the various districts all consider that there has been an increase in this class of crime during the last five years, and this increase is more especially remarkable during the years 1873 and 1874.

Turning to the Government crime returns, table 5, I find under the head of "Aggravated Assaults on Women and Children" and "Assaults on Peace Officers," in those cases to which a punishment of over two months' imprisonment has been awarded, an increase from 48 in 1870 to 145 in 1874.

This increase is doubtless due in some measure to the determination of the magistrates to deal severely with these classes of cases, but it also confirms the impression produced by the figures I have given on your form, that these offences are on the increase.

I consider this increase to be attributable to the great increase of wages and to the shorter hours of labour, the former leading to increased drunkenness, and the latter to increased time and opportunity for domestic and out-door brawling.

As to the remedy, I believe that any general increase in the periods of imprisonment would lead to great distress among the wives and families of the offenders, and might thus conduce to a more general compromising of the cases. I think, however, that a

more general application of the punishment of imprisonment without the option of a fine might have a salutary effect, especially among men earning large wages.

I believe, however, that the punishment of flogging is perhaps the only deterrent which will produce an effect on certain natures, and the objection to its brutalizing tendency hardly applies to persons already brutalized beyond the reach of all ordinary punishment.

I am inclined to think that the power of flogging should be given to an ordinary bench of magistrates, but the cases to which it should be applied should be very clearly defined under a distinctive denomination, such as "brutal assaults," "brutal and indecent assault," &c.

To constitute a brutal assault, the injury should be such as to disable the victim for some time. It should be without provocation, or out of all proportion to the provocation, and continued or repeated after resistance had ceased, and after time had been given for the abatement of passion.

An assault by several on one person would frequently come under the denomination of a "brutal assault," as there could be no pretence of apprehended resistance, and all could hardly be animated by a common feeling of passion.

Among "brutal and indecent assaults" (which would seldom be dealt with summarily) I would class a combined assault by several men on the virtue of one woman; or an assault where a man is so far lost to decency as to commit an offence in the presence of, or with the assistance of another woman; or an indecent assault on a child of tender years, where no excuse of passion other than an absolutely brutal passion could exist.

5. The crime of garrotting has never been prevalent in this district, and has practically become so far obsolete that in only one case has the punishment of flogging been awarded during the last five years.

I have, &c.

W. CONGREVE,

Chief Constable of Staffordshire.

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK.

Suffolk Constabulary, Chief Constable's Office,

Sir, Ipswich, Nov. 5, 1874.

I have the honour to forward your return filled in as requested.

We have, as may be seen by it, very few assaults which come under the head of "brutal."

No case of garrotting has occurred in this county.

I have, &c.

CLEMENT HEIGHAM,

Chief Constable of Suffolk.

COUNTY OF SURREY.

Surrey Constabulary, Head Quarters, Guildford,

Sir, October 27, 1874.

I have the honour to acknowledge your Circular Letter dated the 15th instant, and I now beg to enclose for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, the return of convictions for brutal assaults, as distinguished on the one hand from trifling assaults, and on the other from indecent assaults.

In all cases of brutal assaults, particularly those committed upon women and children, I have no hesitation in saying that a good sound flogging is the most effective punishment, and the one most dreaded.

No instance of garrotting has ever been brought to the notice of the police, in that portion of the county beyond the metropolitan police district, and which is under my jurisdiction.

I have, &c.

H. C. HASTINGS.

Chief Constable of Surrey.

COUNTY OF SUSSEX (WEST).

Sir,

West Sussex Constabulary, Fittleworth, Pulborough,
Nov. 14, 1874.

I have the honour to enclose return of convictions for brutal assaults.

There has been an increase in brutal assaults which (3) I attribute to drunkenness caused by the higher wages and increased prosperity of the working classes.

I consider if a man was sure to be well flogged when he assaulted his wife or any woman living with him it would greatly check this offence.

There has never been a case of garrotting in the Western division of Sussex.

I have, &c.

F. MONTGOMERIE,

Chief Constable of West Sussex.

COUNTY OF SUSSEX (EAST).

Sir,

Constabulary Office, Lewes, November 10, 1874.

In reply to your communication of the 15th ultimo, I have to inform you for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross that there has been no increase of brutal assaults during the last five years, and enclose herewith a return of convictions for such offences.

With a view of diminishing brutal assaults on women and children I would suggest as a remedy that the cat should be administered the same as for the offence of garrotting, which punishment has proved very beneficial in districts where such offences have been committed.

In my district no case of garrotting has occurred.

I have, &c.

H. F. HACKAY,

Chief Constable.

NORTH RIDING OF YORKSHIRE.

Sir,

Yorks, N. R., Northallerton, Nov. 5, 1874.

I have the honour to enclose the return of convictions for brutal assaults as directed in your circular of the 15th ultimo.

It will be observed that there has been a considerable increase in the number of these assaults during the last year, as also in the preceding one over the two previous years.

I can only ascribe this increase to the high rate of wages throughout the country enabling men of low habits to indulge in drink to excess, when they become violent and ungovernable, and thus commit outrages which they would not do in their sober moments.

By improving the moral tone of this class of persons we should go far to diminish these offences, at the same time the power of directing the infliction of the lash in cases tried by juries would, I think, be a means of checking this growing offence.

The offence of garrotting has seldom or ever occurred in this riding.

I have, &c.

THOMAS HILL,

Chief Constable, N. R. Yorks.

WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Wakefield, Nov. 6, 1874.

In reply to your circular letter of the 15th ult. in reference to brutal assaults I have the honour to enclose a return on the prescribed form of the convictions for such assaults during the last five years within the West Riding jurisdiction.

From the above return it will be seen that there has been a steady increase in this class of offences attributable no doubt to the high wages earned and the consequent amount of idleness and drunkenness which prevails amongst the lower classes.

With regard to the remedy which should be applied I am of opinion that flogging should be authorised in all cases of brutal assault which are now in many instances much too leniently dealt with.

Garrotting has practically ceased in this district, and there can be no doubt whatever that this result is due to the powers given under 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44.

I have, &c.

DUNCAN McNEILL,

Chief Constable, West Riding Yorkshire.

EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE.

2. It appears there has been a gradual increase of assaults since 1871, (3.) chiefly attributable in my opinion to drink and the gradual rise in agricultural wages.

3. In my opinion the punishment of flogging might be effectually administered in the cases of brutal and savage assaults alluded to.

4. There has been a total absence of garrotting in this Riding for the last eight or nine years.

I am, &c.

H. V. BOWEN, Major,

Chief Constable, East Riding, Yorkshire.

COUNTY OF WARWICK.

Chief Constable's Office, Kenilworth.

December 2, 1874.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward you enclosed herewith, a return of the number of convictions for brutal assaults committed in this county in each of the last five years.

In answer to the questions contained in your circular letter dated 15th October last, I respectfully have to state that during the present year there has been a considerable increase of summary convictions for brutal assaults as compared with the previous four years, and I consider the increase is in a great measure attributable to the free use of intoxicating liquors, as it is invariably proved in evidence at the hearing of these cases, that the prisoners were either drunk, or in a semi state of drunkenness at the time they committed the outrage.

I would suggest that a discretionary power be given to magistrates to order corporal punishment as a remedy for diminishing these offences, and also to order the offender to be kept a certain period in solitary confinement during his imprisonment in gaol.

The offence of garrotting has practically ceased in this county, and I cannot attribute the result to any other cause than flogging, which is a punishment far more dreaded by most prisoners than the other portion of their sentence.

I have, &c.

JAMES ISAAC,

Chief Constable.

COUNTIES OF WESTMORELAND AND CUMBERLAND.

Chief Constable's Office, Carlisle,

November 10, 1874.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose the returns called for in your circular dated the 15th ultimo.

Brutal assaults and grievous offences against the person have greatly increased, especially in the mining districts, during the last three years. This is no doubt mainly attributable to the increase that has taken place in drunkenness, which, to a certain extent, has been induced by the higher wages with less work that has generally existed. In many of the cases of brutal assaults by husbands on their wives the defendants alleged that on returning from work they found their wives drunk, their homes and

families neglected, and that quarrelling and passion followed, which ended in the crimes of violence complained of. Since the passing of the Licensing Act of 1872, Lord Aberdare's Act, the habit of buying liquor just before the public houses are closed has sprung up. This is called the "bottle system." It is resorted to to enable numbers of men to drink together longer than they are permitted to stay at the public-house. They generally go to the house of one or more of the party, and there they drink as long as the liquor lasts. Frequently they sit up carousing in this way to a late hour. Women and young persons are generally present on those occasions. What takes place is not very edifying, and the example thus set has been attended with very bad consequences in causing intemperance among women and young persons. This practice is a mere evasion of the law, and though it may not be contrary to the letter of the Intoxicating Liquors Acts, it is clearly at variance with the spirit of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th sections of the 35 & 36 Vict. cap. 94, Lord Aberdare's Act.

In the cases embraced in the returns six persons summarily convicted were sentenced to six months, and two to two months imprisonment without a fine, 16 were fined 5*l.* or six months, one was fined 10*l.* or two months imprisonment. The average punishment awarded was a fine of 1*l.* 15*s.* or six week's imprisonment. In some cases of serious assaults the defendants were bailed to appear in consequences of the injured persons being unable to attend in the first instance before the magistrates as witnesses. The invariable result was that the offence was compromised and the offending party escaped punishment. Frequently, after a summons or warrant is taken out the case is compromised previously to being brought before the magistrates. This is often done by the payment of money. In the case of a man and wife it is generally owing to the reluctance of the wife to appear as a witness against the husband.

At the assizes held at Carlisle on the 31st July 1857, the late Mr. Baron Watson held that in cases of assault with intent to do bodily harm where the skin was broken and blood flowed the offence amounted to felony. In many of the assaults committed in the last few years the injuries inflicted on the persons assaulted have been of a most serious nature. Brutal assaults on the police while in the execution of their duty have also largely increased.

Crimes of violence with evident intent to do grievous bodily injury should not be treated so leniently as they are generally. This offence should be subject to quite as great a punishment as serious offences against property are. A minimum imprisonment with a flogging should be fixed by law for a first offence, while accumulative punishment should be made compulsory for every subsequent conviction. Fines in such cases are not felt to be a very serious punishment because they are generally paid out of a common fund or by a subscription got up for the purpose. No doubt the more speedy the punishment after the offence is committed the better the example would be in preventing crime, and if some plan could be devised to have such cases promptly disposed of at petty sessions this deterrent object would be the more effectually secured, while any miscarriage of justice that might result from delay and compromise would be guarded against. One of the many advantages to the public that would arise from the appointment of a public prosecutor would be the certainty of having all cases of this nature promptly and efficiently prosecuted, and the law strictly carried out.

Drunken and riotous conduct has become very prevalent. The number of persons brought before the magistrates charged with that offence has greatly increased in the last few years. The fines awarded in these cases, even after repeated convictions, seldom exceed 10*s.* or 20*s.* and the expenses, fines of 1*s.* are sometimes inflicted, the average fine is 5*s.* and the expenses, or seven days' imprisonment. (4.) If a minimum punishment were fixed for this offence, to accumulate after a second conviction, the effect would be to indirectly prevent many of the brutal assaults that are now committed by men while in a drunken and riotous state; at the same time the disgraceful language and behaviour generally indulged in by drunken and riotous men, which so seriously disturbs the peace and good order of a town, could be successfully prevented.

The offence of garrotting has practically ceased in this district; that is to be entirely attributed to the salutary effect produced on garroters by the punishment of flogging authorised by the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44, and (4) I am confident that if a similar punishment could be inflicted on persons convicted of having committed brutal assaults and grievous bodily injury, such offences would be very soon put down.

I have, &c.

J. DUNNE,

Chief Constable of the Counties of Cumberland
and Westmoreland.

COUNTY OF WILTS.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Nursteed, Devizes, Wilts,
November 10, 1874.

I have the honour to forward herewith the return called for by your circular letter of the 15th of October last.

I have, &c.

ROBT. STERNE,
Chief Constable for Wilts.

2. There has been an increase in brutal assaults on both men and women. Drunkenness is at the bottom of a good number of these cases.

Imprisonment, without option of a fine, and, in very bad cases, liberal application of the naval cat in addition, and to be administered by a man who knows how to use it.

Garrotting is unknown in Wiltshire, but I have no doubt flogging is one of the best punishments for the offence.

COUNTY OF WORCESTER.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Worcester, November 9, 1874.

I have the honour to forward herewith a return for the county of Worcester, containing the information asked for in Mr. Secretary Cross's circular letter of the 15th ult.

I would desire to remark, however, that although the number of offences of the description under report has considerably increased of late, the increment is not spread over the whole county in equal proportion, but is found almost entirely in the manufacturing districts of Dudley, Stourbridge, &c.

It is difficult to attribute this increase with certainty to any particular cause, but, as intoxication is generally shown to have existed at the time of the assault, and is usually pleaded in mitigation of punishment, it is fair to presume that the higher rate of wages lately obtained has afforded a rough and uneducated class greater opportunities for excessive drinking, and has so led to the increased commission of the offences recorded in the return.

As regards any remedy for the purpose of diminishing these offences, I believe it would be beneficial to give the magistrates power to inflict a maximum of six months' imprisonment, instead of two months, with a corresponding scale of fines for "common assaults," as where no weapon has been used, although the assault may have been cowardly and brutal enough, offenders too often escape with a small fine or short imprisonment.

As regards flogging, I would not desire to see it introduced as a summary punishment, but it would probably prove a deterrent, if inflicted as portion of a sentence, after conviction by a jury at sessions or assizes.

With reference to the offence of garrotting, there has not, as far as I am aware, been any case since the passing of the Act 26 & 27 Vict. c. 44, but I cannot learn that the offence was at any time very prevalent in this county.

I have, &c.

GEORGE CARMICHAEL.
Lieut.-Col. and Chief Constable of Worcestershire.

COUNTY OF ANGLESEY.

Sir,

Menai Bridge, Nov. 2, 1874.

In reply to your circular dated Oct. 15th ult., in reference to "brutal assaults," I beg to state for the information of the Right Hon. the Home Secretary, that the county

of Anglesey is comparatively free from the commission of such offences, the convictions as a rule being confined to common assaults, &c.

The form attached is compiled from the annual tables 4 and 5 for the years named.

None.

"Flogging" and in cases of kicking, "The Bastinado."

Garrotting has never to my knowledge, occurred in this county.

I have, &c.

D. W. GRIFFITH,
Chief Constable, County of Anglesey.

COUNTY OF BRECON.

Sir,

Chief Constable's Office, Brecon, Nov. 21, 1874.

I have the honour to reply, in answer to questions in your circular letter, dated Whitehall, 15th October, 1874.

The number of convictions for brutal assaults which have taken place in the county of Brecon during the last five years, is 22.

There has been no increase in brutal assaults.

Flogging—in addition to other punishments.

No offence of garrotting has taken place in this county.

I have, &c.

EDMD. GWYNNE,
Chief Constable of the County.

COUNTY OF CARDIGAN.

Sir,

Cardiganshire Constabulary, Chief Constable's Office,
Aberayron, Oct. 29, 1874.

In reply to your letter regarding brutal assaults, I have the honour to report to you, for the information of the Chief Secretary of State, that during the long period (upwards of 30 years) that I have held the appointment of Chief Constable of Cardiganshire, there has not been one instance of what may be termed a brutal assault, as distinguished from trifling, or indecent assaults in this county.

The offence of garrotting is not known here.

I have, &c.

W. C. FREEMAN,
Chief Constable of Cardiganshire.

COUNTY OF CARMARTHEN.

Sends return.

COUNTY OF CARNARVON.

Sir,

County Constabulary Force, Chief Constable's Office,
Carnarvon, Nov. 12, 1874.

I beg to forward to you the return of convictions for brutal assaults that have taken place in my district during the last five years.

I do not know that I can suggest any remedy for the purpose of diminishing these offences.

I have had no case of garrotting in my district.

I have, &c.

CHARLES PEARSON,
Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF DENBIGH.

The offence of garrotting is unknown in this county.

JOHN DENMAN,
Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF FLINT.

Sir, Chief Constable's Office, Rhyl, October 31, 1874.

I have now the pleasure to forward the "Return of Convictions for Brutal Assaults" made up from 1870 to 1874 inclusive, as per your request.

I think the increase in brutal assaults is (3) mainly attributable to the present high rate of wage and excessive drinking and particularly bad ardent spirits.

I am inclined to recommend the punishment of flogging in cases of brutal violence but the tribunal in whom such authority is vested is a matter for the mature and careful consideration of the legislature.

I have, &c.
PETER BROWNE,
Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF GLAMORGAN.

Chief Constable's Office, Canton, Cardiff,
November 25, 1874.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward you a return, showing as nearly as possible the number of brutal assaults, as distinguished from trifling assaults and indecent assaults, for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, committed during the last five years.

I have, &c.
H. GEO. LINDSAY,
Chief Constable.

COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY.

Chief Constable's Office, Newtown, Montgomeryshire,
October 28, 1874.

Sir,

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter and form requesting to be informed of the number of brutal assaults that have occurred in this county during the last five years, and in reply have the honour to inform you that the form which I herewith enclose shows the number of those offences that have taken place in this county during that period.

I do not consider that these offences are on the increase.

With regard to the third question in your letter, as to the remedy for the purpose of diminishing these offences, I would suggest for the worst class corporal punishment, and for those of a lighter description, for the first offence, imprisonment without the option of paying a fine, and for a second offence corporal punishment.

As regards the fourth question there has been no case of garrotting in this county.

I am, &c.
J. DANILY,
Chief Constable of Montgomeryshire.

COUNTY OF PEMBROKE.

Sir,

Chief Offices, Haverfordwest,
October 26, 1874.

I beg most respectfully to inclose the report of "brutal assaults" as required, and made up as accurately as I possibly can. I am of an opinion that if power was given to inflict corporal punishment in these cases it would have a salutary effect. There are three men now in custody who had been charged with an aggravated assault, but the man having since died they stand now charged with wilful murder.

We have never had any garrotting in this county.

I have, &c.
W. B. STOKES,
Chief Constable.

RADNORSHIRE CONSTABULARY.

Sir,

Penybout, October 28, 1874.

I beg to inform Mr. Secretary Cross that no case of "brutal assault" has occurred in the county of Radnor during the last five years, also that I am of opinion that the present law is insufficient to cope with the brutal cases of assault which are of daily occurrence in the large towns, and I have no doubt that if the lash could be inflicted it would have the desired effect.

I am, &c.
J. J. WHEELDON,
Chief Constable.

Abstract of Reports of Chief Constables as to Brutal Assaults.

County.	Year.	Brutal Assaults on Women and Children.			Brutal Assaults on Men.			Total of Brutal Assaults.		
		Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.		
		Summary.	On In-dictment.	Total.	Summary.	On In-dictment.	Total.	Summary.	On In-dictment.	Total.
ENGLAND.										
Bedford	1870	3	1	4	4	—	4	7	1	8
"	1871	6	—	6	4	7	11	10	7	17
"	1872	5	—	5	8	—	8	13	—	13
"	1873	5	—	5	5	—	5	10	—	10
"	1874	6	1	7	7	1	8	13	2	15
Berks	1870	3	—	3	—	—	—	3	—	3
"	1871	3	—	3	2	—	2	5	—	5
"	1872	3	1	4	—	—	—	3	1	4
"	1873	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1
"	1874	—	—	—	2	—	2	2	—	2
Bucks	1870	5	1	6	8	7	15	13	—	21
"	1871	4	—	4	5	—	5	9	—	9
"	1872	8	—	8	9	4	13	17	4	21
"	1873	3	—	3	6	4	10	9	4	13
"	1874	6	—	6	4	2	6	10	2	12
Cambridge	1870	7	1	8	4	3	7	11	4	15
"	1871	2	—	2	1	7	8	3	7	10
"	1872	1	—	1	2	—	2	3	—	3
"	1873	3	—	3	8	—	8	11	—	11
"	1874	4	1	5	6	1	7	10	2	12
Isle of Ely	1870	3	—	3	—	1	1	3	1	4
"	1871	1	—	1	1	—	1	2	—	2
"	1872	4	—	4	2	1	3	6	1	7
"	1873	5	—	5	—	—	—	5	—	5
"	1874	3	1	4	3	—	3	6	1	7
Cheshire	1870	11	1	12	35	3	38	46	4	50
"	1871	9	—	9	17	4	21	26	4	30
"	1872	10	1	11	30	3	33	40	4	44
"	1873	12	—	12	18	3	21	30	3	33
"	1874	15	—	15	27	2	29	42	2	44
Cornwall	1870	1	—	1	5	—	5	6	—	6
"	1871	1	—	1	1	1	2	2	1	3
"	1872	2	1	3	1	—	1	3	1	4
"	1873	—	—	—	2	—	2	2	—	2
"	1874	3	—	3	2	—	2	5	—	5
Cumberland	1870	19	—	19	37	—	37	56	—	56
"	1871	16	1	17	40	8	48	56	9	65
"	1872	13	—	13	45	1	46	58	1	59
"	1873	29	1	30	53	1	54	82	2	84
"	1874	26	—	26	52	—	52	78	—	78
Derby	1870	41	—	41	56	7	63	97	7	104
"	1871	36	—	36	48	1	49	84	1	85
"	1872	25	1	26	48	5	53	73	6	79
"	1873	27	—	27	52	3	55	79	3	82
"	1874	32	1	33	63	6	69	95	7	102
Devon	1870	5	—	5	24	5	29	29	5	34
"	1871	10	2	12	23	3	26	33	5	38
"	1872	11	1	12	21	1	22	32	2	34
"	1873	13	—	13	25	—	25	38	—	38
"	1874	4	—	4	15	1	16	19	1	20
Dorset	1870	10	1	11	11	—	11	21	1	22
"	1871	13	2	15	11	13	24	24	15	39
"	1872	7	—	7	13	2	15	20	2	22
"	1873	11	—	11	16	1	17	27	1	28
"	1874	12	—	12	14	1	15	26	1	27
Durham	1870	84	1	85	161	11	172	245	12	257
"	1871	80	—	80	179	2	181	259	2	261
"	1872	88	—	88	203	2	205	291	2	293
"	1873	127	1	128	219	1	220	346	2	348
"	1874	115	1	116	267	1	268	382	2	384
Essex	1870	6	—	6	17	2	19	23	2	25
"	1871	3	1	4	8	1	9	11	2	13
"	1872	3	1	4	12	4	16	15	5	20
"	1873	6	1	7	9	11	20	15	12	27
"	1874	3	—	3	7	3	10	10	3	13

Abstract of Reports of Chief Constables as to Brutal Assaults—*cont.*

County.	Year.	Brutal Assaults on Women and Children.			Brutal Assaults on Men.			Total of Brutal Assaults.		
		Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.		
		Summary.	On Indictment.	Total.	Summary.	On Indictment.	Total.	Summary.	On Indictment.	Total.
Gloucester	1870	43	1	44	58	5	63	101	6	107
"	1871	38	3	41	55	2	57	93	5	98
"	1872	43	2	45	53	9	62	96	11	107
"	1873	47	4	51	58	5	63	105	9	114
"	1874	45	3	48	41	2	43	86	5	91
Hants	1870	12	2	14	21	3	24	33	5	38
"	1871	6	1	7	28	1	29	34	2	36
"	1872	8	2	10	12	7	19	20	9	29
"	1873	1	1	2	10	5	15	11	6	17
"	1874	13	—	13	25	3	28	38	3	41
Hereford	1870	7	—	7	10	5	15	17	5	22
"	1871	4	—	4	5	3	78	9	3	12
"	1872	6	—	6	9	1	10	15	1	16
"	1873	—	—	—	8	2	10	8	2	10
"	1874	2	1	3	5	1	6	7	2	9
Herts	1870	5	—	5	19	2	21	24	2	26
"	1871	7	—	7	9	—	9	16	—	16
"	1872	4	—	4	24	—	24	28	—	28
"	1873	6	—	6	11	1	12	17	1	18
"	1874	11	—	11	9	—	9	20	—	20
Huntingdon	1870	11	2	13	7	—	7	18	2	20
"	1871	8	—	8	6	—	6	14	—	14
"	1872	4	—	4	16	—	16	20	—	20
"	1873	9	—	9	11	1	12	20	1	21
"	1874	4	—	4	18	—	18	22	—	22
Kent	1870	14	1	15	13	4	17	27	5	32
"	1871	16	1	17	13	2	15	29	3	32
"	1872	12	1	13	17	2	19	29	3	32
"	1873	14	1	15	15	4	19	29	5	34
"	1874	25	1	26	13	4	17	38	5	43
Lancaster	1870	134	—	134	174	35	209	308	35	343
"	1871	118	4	122	216	17	233	334	21	355
"	1872	157	6	163	217	18	235	374	24	398
"	1873	131	6	137	235	31	266	366	37	403
"	1874	183	11	194	283	30	313	466	41	507
Leicester	1870	3	4	7	—	4	4	3	8	11
"	1871	4	—	4	—	6	6	4	6	10
"	1872	2	3	5	—	6	6	2	9	11
"	1873	3	—	3	—	3	3	3	3	6
"	1874	7	—	7	—	2	2	7	2	9
Lincoln	1870	19	—	19	9	1	10	28	1	29
"	1871	8	5	13	14	—	14	22	5	27
"	1872	12	3	15	22	4	26	34	7	41
"	1873	11	1	12	10	5	15	21	6	27
"	1874	9	—	9	15	2	17	24	2	26
Middlesex :										
Metropolis	1870	253	27	280	273	96	369	526	123	649
"	1871	268	36	304	254	71	325	522	107	629
"	1872	271	39	310	279	95	374	550	134	684
"	1873	281	42	323	245	71	316	526	113	639
"	1874	315	36	351	290	101	391	605	137	742
City of London	1870	16	—	16	24	1	25	40	1	41
"	1871	9	—	9	17	3	20	26	3	29
"	1872	13	—	13	11	2	13	24	2	26
"	1873	22	—	22	8	2	10	30	2	32
"	1874	19	—	19	9	4	13	28	4	32
Monmouth	1870	19	—	19	31	6	37	50	6	56
"	1871	36	—	36	23	10	33	59	10	69
"	1872	18	—	18	38	5	43	56	5	61
"	1873	20	4	24	32	2	34	52	6	58
"	1874	14	—	14	19	8	27	33	8	14
Norfolk	1870	5	2	7	—	2	2	5	4	9
"	1871	4	1	5	1	—	1	5	1	6
"	1872	—	2	2	2	—	2	2	2	4
"	1873	3	1	4	2	2	4	5	3	8
"	1874	3	—	3	2	2	4	5	2	7
Northampton	1870	2	2	4	1	—	1	3	2	5
"	1871	6	3	9	4	3	7	10	6	16
"	1872	6	1	7	—	5	5	6	6	12
"	1873	2	1	3	—	11	11	2	12	14
"	1874	4	—	4	2	1	3	6	1	7

Abstract of Reports of Chief Constables as to Brutal Assaults—*cont.*

County.	Year.	Brutal Assaults on Women and Children.			Brutal Assaults on Men.			Total of Brutal Assaults.		
		Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.		
		Summary.	On Indictment.	Total.	Summary.	On Indictment.	Total.	Summary.	On Indictment.	Total.
Northumberland	1870	26	6	32	—	2	2	26	8	34
"	1871	10	6	16	—	6	6	10	12	22
"	1872	16	4	20	—	1	1	16	5	21
"	1873	5	7	12	—	1	1	5	8	13
"	1874	78	13	91	—	1	1	78	14	92
Nottingham	1870	The Chief Constable states that he is unable to furnish a correct return of the number of brutal assaults during the last five years.								
"	1871									
"	1872									
"	1873									
"	1874									
Oxford	1870	19	4	23	23	2	25	42	6	48
"	1871	16	1	17	18	1	19	34	2	36
"	1872	16	3	19	25	1	26	41	4	45
"	1873	11	1	12	28	2	30	39	4	45
"	1874	15	1	16	19	2	21	34	3	37
Peterborough	1870	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
"	1871	2	—	2	—	2	2	2	2	4
"	1872	1	2	3	—	2	2	1	4	5
"	1873	1	1	2	—	—	—	1	1	2
"	1874	3	1	4	—	1	1	3	2	5
Rutland	1870	There have been no cases of brutal assaults in the county during the last five years.								
"	1871									
"	1872									
"	1873									
"	1874									
Salop	1870	There have been no cases of brutal assaults in this county during the last five years.								
"	1871									
"	1872									
"	1873									
"	1874									
Somerset	1870	37	—	37	40	8	48	77	8	85
"	1871	38	2	40	39	2	41	77	4	81
"	1872	20	—	20	31	7	38	51	7	58
"	1873	24	—	24	37	8	45	61	8	69
"	1874	22	1	23	18	6	24	40	7	47
Stafford	1870	—	56	—	—	136	—	—	192	192
"	1871	—	97	—	—	129	—	—	226	226
"	1872	—	82	—	—	122	—	—	204	204
"	1873	—	99	—	—	153	—	—	252	252
"	1874	—	113	—	—	192	—	—	305	305
Suffolk	1870	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	2	2
"	1871	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
"	1872	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1
"	1873	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
"	1874	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Surrey	1870	6	—	6	—	—	—	6	—	6
"	1871	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	1
"	1872	3	—	3	—	—	—	3	—	3
"	1873	4	—	4	—	—	—	4	—	4
"	1874	8	—	8	—	—	—	8	—	8
Sussex (West)	1870	6	—	6	11	—	11	17	—	17
"	1871	10	—	10	5	—	5	15	—	15
"	1872	10	1	11	5	1	6	15	2	17
"	1873	5	—	5	4	—	4	9	—	9
"	1874	9	—	9	10	—	10	19	—	19
Sussex (East)	1870	13	2	15	3	8	11	16	10	26
"	1871	6	—	6	3	4	7	9	4	13
"	1872	5	—	5	13	1	14	18	1	19
"	1873	8	—	8	4	1	5	12	1	13
"	1874	10	—	10	4	1	5	14	1	15
Warwick	1870	13	—	13	13	6	19	26	6	32
"	1871	11	1	12	15	4	19	26	5	31
"	1872	7	1	8	7	2	9	14	3	17
"	1873	11	—	11	11	1	12	22	1	23
"	1874	17	1	18	29	4	33	46	5	51
Westmoreland	1870	1	—	1	9	—	9	10	—	10
"	1871	2	—	2	5	1	6	7	1	8
"	1872	2	—	2	16	5	21	18	5	23
"	1873	2	—	2	11	—	11	13	—	13
"	1874	1	—	1	10	3	13	11	3	14

Abstract of Reports of Chief Constables as to Brutal Assaults—*cont.*

County.	Year.	Brutal Assaults on Women and Children.			Brutal Assaults on Men.			Total of Brutal Assaults.		
		Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.			Number of Convictions.		
		Summary.	On In-dictment.	Total.	Summary.	On In-dictment.	Total.	Summary.	On In-dictment.	Total.
Wilts	1870	21	5	26	18	3	21	39	8	47
"	1871	20	5	25	24	5	29	44	10	54
"	1872	27	2	29	12	1	13	39	3	42
"	1873	12	4	16	24	3	37	36	7	43
"	1874	29	2	31	25	9	34	54	11	65
Worcester	1870	26	5	31	31	6	37	57	11	65
"	1871	36	2	38	46	3	49	82	5	87
"	1872	30	—	30	44	5	49	74	5	79
"	1873	35	—	35	50	1	51	85	1	86
"	1874	53	1	54	74	4	78	127	5	132
York (E. Riding)	1870	6	1	7	11	1	12	17	2	19
"	1871	5	1	6	8	2	10	13	3	16
"	1872	6	—	6	12	4	16	18	4	22
"	1873	3	—	3	23	3	26	26	3	29
"	1874	9	—	9	30	3	33	39	3	42
York (N. Riding)	1870	19	1	20	35	1	36	54	2	56
"	1871	11	1	12	11	1	12	22	2	24
"	1872	23	—	23	23	—	23	46	—	46
"	1873	17	—	17	37	—	37	54	—	54
"	1874	30	1	31	41	5	46	71	6	77
York (W. Riding)	1870	112	4	116	121	17	138	233	21	254
"	1871	107	3	110	116	4	120	223	7	230
"	1872	137	19	156	148	8	156	285	27	312
"	1873	119	7	126	180	9	189	299	16	315
"	1874	146	6	152	217	16	233	363	22	385
WALES.										
Anglesea	1870	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
"	1871	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
"	1872	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1
"	1873	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
"	1874	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brecon	1870	4	—	4	2	1	3	6	1	7
"	1871	1	—	1	2	1	3	3	1	4
"	1872	—	2	2	3	—	3	3	2	5
"	1873	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	1
"	1874	2	—	2	2	1	3	4	1	5
Cardigan	1870	There have been no cases of brutal assaults in this county during the past five years.								
"	1871									
"	1872									
"	1873									
"	1874									
Carmarthen	1870	3	—	3	5	—	5	8	—	8
"	1871	4	—	4	5	2	7	9	2	11
"	1872	5	—	5	4	—	4	9	—	9
"	1873	3	—	3	2	—	2	5	—	5
"	1874	5	—	5	4	—	4	9	—	9
Carnarvon	1870	2	—	2	13	1	14	15	1	16
"	1871	2	—	2	15	—	15	17	—	17
"	1872	—	1	1	8	6	14	8	7	15
"	1873	2	—	2	13	—	13	15	—	15
"	1874	2	—	2	16	—	16	18	—	18
Denbigh	1870	3	—	3	6	2	8	9	2	11
"	1871	1	1	2	4	1	5	5	2	7
"	1872	1	—	1	8	1	9	9	1	10
"	1873	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	2
"	1874	1	1	2	2	3	5	3	4	7
Flint	1870	2	—	2	1	—	1	3	—	3
"	1871	—	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	2
"	1872	1	—	1	1	—	1	2	—	2
"	1873	—	—	—	2	2	4	2	2	4
"	1874	1	—	1	1	3	4	2	3	5
Glamorgan	1870	17	5	22	78	29	107	95	34	129
"	1871	41	5	46	64	16	80	105	21	126
"	1872	27	7	34	73	16	89	100	23	123
"	1873	25	5	30	64	21	85	89	26	115
"	1874	37	4	41	86	18	104	123	22	145

Abstract of Reports of Chief Constables as to Brutal Assaults—*cont.*

[illegible]

LONDON:

Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT (REGINA v. HIBBERT).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 27 May 1875;—for,

“COPY of SHORTHAND NOTES of the EVIDENCE and SUMMING UP of Baron
Cleasby in the Case of *Regina v. Hibbert* and others, tried at the Old
Bailey on the 5th and 6th days of last May.”

OLD COURT.

Wednesday, 5th May, and Thursday, 6th May 1875.

Before Mr. Baron CLEASBY.

WALTER HIBBERT, ADAM WEILER, RICHARD REED, WILLIAM HAM, and WILLIAM
ALEXANDER MATTHEWS were indicted for unlawfully conspiring to coerce *William*
Edgar Graham and others in their trade.

Other Counts.—To coerce the workmen by molesting and obstructing them.

Eighth and Ninth Counts.—For conspiring to molest and obstruct the employers and the
men by watching and besetting the house with a view to coerce them.

Other Counts.—Varying the mode of stating the charge.

Mr. *Hawkins*, Q.C., with Mr. *Besley*, conducted the Prosecution; Mr. *Hopwood*, Q.C.,
with Mr. *Poland*, appeared for Hibbert and Weiler; Mr. *Crisp* for Reed; Mr. *Wright*
for Ham; and Mr. *Harris* for Matthews.

WILLIAM EDGAR GRAHAM:—I carry on business with several partners, under the
style of Jackson & Graham, as upholsterers, cabinet makers, and general house furnishers.
We have two factories, one attached to the warehouse in Oxford-street and the other in
Ogle-street; they are perfectly distinct. The course of business at the Oxford-street
factory has not been altered; we were working piecework by the union book; by the
union I do not mean the Cabinet Makers' Alliance, but a west-end society; that is a
trades' union of the workpeople. The union book is a book that was agreed upon by the
masters and men many years ago; that mode of labour has not been changed at all in
Oxford-street. At the Ogle-street factory up to the 13th November last the men were
paid by day-work or by the hour; there was no piece-work done there. On the 13th
November we gave a notice of our intention to change that system to piece-work at what
is called “lump prices;” that means that the contract with the workman is for the entire
finishing of the article, to take a contract to do so much work at a price. In the notice
we gave we offered employment to all the workpeople on the new system. We gave the
notice on the 13th that the change would take place on Monday, the 16th. I did not know
any of the defendants previous to the 13th; I had only seen Matthews, who had once
worked in our place. He was not working there at that time. The other defendants had
never worked for us. In consequence of a communication from our foreman, I consented to
receive a deputation from the Alliance Cabinet Makers' Association, and I did so on the
16th about 11 or 12 o'clock. Before I was asked to receive the deputation, the workshop
in Ogle-street had been opened for the men to come to work under the new system; only
one man and two boys presented themselves. Before that there had been about 40 in
the cabinet shop. The deputation consisted of Ham, Reed, and a man named Bright.
Reed began the conversation, and Bright followed. Reed asked me whether I was inclined
to alter the terms upon which we were prepared to do business; if I would allow the
prices to be determined by a shop committee. I said “No.” There was a long rambling
conversation after which had nothing to do with it in particular. I was asked by
Bright whether the idea had entered my head that I should not be able to get work-
people. I said “No, it never had; that with good shops and good pay we should always

be able to get men." They then retired. I did not in any way entertain their proposals; I told them that we wanted to get the best men in the trade, that they might be able to earn what they were worth. After that, on the 17th, we received this letter:—(*Read.* "Alliance Cabinet Makers' Association, 3, Mitre-square. 17th November '74. Gentlemen, I am directed by the executive committee to inform you that the members of the above association cannot accept the terms proposed to the deputation that waited upon you on Monday. Trusting you will reconsider your determination, I am, yours obediently, J. R. Smith, General Secretary.") We replied to that letter on the 19th. This is a press copy of the letter. (*This being objected to, Mr. J. R. Smith was called on his subpoena to produce the original, but stated that he had not got it. Mr. Baron Cleasby did not consider the copy could be read.*) We then advertised in the London and country newspapers for workpeople, and on the week following the 16th I think we had one or two applications. About the 24th November I saw Matthews near our factory, in Ogle-street, with a man named Tommany; I generally went to the factory between 9 and 10 o'clock in the morning, and left between 10 and 11 o'clock; sometimes I went there two or three times a day; I always went there in the morning. It was between 9 and 11 o'clock in the morning on the 24th, that I saw Matthews and the other; they were walking up and down in Ogle-street, within about 20 yards of the factory. They did not enter the factory, they were sometimes 60 or 70 yards from it. They passed up and down; they went up to the factory. When I saw them first they were on the other side of the road. There is a chapel opposite the factory; I can't tell how long they remained there; I only saw them when I went in and when I came out. For about five weeks after that I saw Matthews near the factory every morning; different people were with him, sometimes Ham, sometimes Reed, and a man whose name I believe is Cavers; they were walking up and down, and if anyone came, apparently applying at the factory or coming near the factory, they generally crossed over and spoke to them. I saw that done. I have seen them as late as 5 o'clock in the evening and before 9 o'clock in the morning. I have been there when they were not there, but as a rule they were there; I don't think I ever saw Ham, Reed, and Matthews all three together. I have seen Weiler and Hibbert there for about three weeks, the first 11 days in February and the last week in January, up to the time when they were arrested. I generally saw them when I went to the factory between 9 and 11 o'clock and when I came out, and when I went at other times. They were in company with other men, whose names I do not know, walking up and down and standing just outside the factory. I have also seen them at midday when the men came out to dinner, about 1 o'clock, and also when they came out in the evening after work. I have seen Hibbert and Weiler together constantly, as well as with others. I have seen about nine persons so conducting themselves opposite the factory; I ought to qualify that by saying I have seen nine only for a definite period. I have seen more than 10 at one time, of whom Hibbert and Weiler were part; when workpeople approached the door of the factory, they spoke to them and talked to them and walked away with them; that has been at the corner of the factory, which is about 20 yards from the door; the door is in a side street, called Ogle-mews; they have been close to the wall of the factory. I have seen as many as 9 or 10 at 1 o'clock when the men came out to dinner, and at 2 o'clock when they came back. I did not like it. This kind of conduct ceased to a great extent after this prosecution commenced, but I saw the prisoners about there occasionally. Before the prosecution commenced we had the very greatest difficulty in keeping persons in our service; after the prosecution was commenced we had not equal difficulty; we had plenty of inquiries.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hopwood.] Ours is a very old firm, and a very extensive one; it might be taken that we discharged the men; we told them that we should not do day work any more; they were told definitely on the Friday that they were discharged on the Saturday, unless they chose to take our new terms. The first thing the deputation asked was why the men had been discharged on Saturday. The Oxford-street factory had been working on piece-work; that which we proposed at Ogle-street was a different mode to that. The men did not tell me that if we chose to adopt the Oxford-street system at Ogle-street they would not offer any opposition. I did not know that that was the case; they did not ask me to work at Ogle-street on the union book; they asked me whether I intended to work by the union book as used in Oxford-street, and I said I did not; that was a book agreed on in 1811. When they asked me that question, I had the very gravest doubt whether they wanted me to work by that, because their society does not work by it, and does not understand it. The defendants work lump work themselves, piece-work at lump prices. I merely understood that they wanted to know what I was going to do. The system at Oxford-street was piece-work in parts; our proposal was piece-work in the lump, at a lump price, say a table or desk, for which a working drawing is given; frankly, our object in doing that was not benevolence, it was to prevent ourselves from being robbed; I don't think that is too strong a term; it would not give us the advantage of making a bargain with anybody to do the whole at a less price than somebody else. We had no fixed price, but the same price would always be quoted for the same work again. No man is bound to take a contract; we should be entitled to make a bargain with each individual what he would do it for. I should think I have seen 10 men at a time about six times at least, spreading over three months, at about 2 o'clock when the men were returning to their work—a little before 2 o'clock as a rule; there were some men from Messrs. Howard's factory, which is about 150 yards off; their dinner

dinner hour was the same as ours. None of the men ever spoke to me; I don't know whether or not I saw any of our old hands in the street at any time.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Crisp*.] We had about 40 men employed at Ogle-street, in November. Stride was one; Parr was foreman; Woodrow, Jewell, Carr, and Russell. Jewell was the only man who remained in the service with the two boys. Carr is foreman of the polishers, and has been there all along; the notice would not apply to him. Woodrow did not remain, he went out on the Saturday or Monday. I don't quite know how Jewell was paid prior to the discharge of the men; afterwards he was paid by piece-work, I think, I can't say for certain, I mean lump work. I believe he had to make a contract, but I don't know, because some of the men began by working day time again to finish the work that was in hand. I can't tell you whether Jewell was one of these, my foreman will be able to tell you. I believe all the men who entered the service after 24th November adopted the piece-work system; the foreman can tell you. I know several of them began day work to finish the work in hand, and after that they went on at lump work. When they left nearly every man had one or two pieces of furniture that he was making to finish, and some of that was not finished for five or six months; during that time payment by the hour was not going on, they were working lump work. I think all the finishing was day work, and that has continued up to the present time; there may have been one man working day work to finish. We manufacture our own cabinet work. During the strike we had to buy a few things. A great many upholsterers in London do not manufacture, they are supplied by trade-working masters; as a rule they are cheap houses and can undersell us, except in machine-made furniture. Our adopting the lump system would not be quite the same thing; we should be more able to compete with the cheap houses; it would benefit the men, it would benefit both parties; it was not entirely to compete with the cheap houses; in part it was. I made a note of the time when I saw Reed (*referring*), it was the second week in December, and the first week in January, and I think on no other occasions. Ogle-street is not above 80 yards long. There is a public-house at the corner of Ogle-street and Foley-street. I don't know the name of it; it is kept by a man named Tennant. Ogle-mews leads out of Ogle-street; it is a *cul de sac*. The entrance to the factory is in Ogle-mews. This (*produced*) is a very good map of the place. The public-house is about 30 yards from the factory. I think it is frequented chiefly by our men. Messrs. Howard's men frequent three other public-houses, they would not come that way.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Harris*.] Matthews came to work for us on 4th October 1872 and remained till 28th March 1874; I expect I saw him every morning when he was there; I have no doubt about his being in the street on 24th November; I never had any doubt about it; I believe he was there the whole of the week; I said before the magistrate, "I saw a man whom I believe to be the defendant Matthews;" I was told that his name was Matthews by the men who worked with him and knew him; I did not know his name when he was working with us; I asked the other people who he was, and they said his name was Matthews; that he had spoken to them and they knew him; I have no doubt he is the man; I saw him within 20 yards of the factory walking up and down. I have heard of a system called the "sweating" system; I think I can explain what it means; it is not the lump system; as I understand it is this: when a man takes a contract per lump he is allowed to have his son or a lad as an apprentice to him or to work for him, and he takes all the money and pays his son what he likes, and he reaps the benefit and not the master. Piece-work is where a man is, for instance, paid for parts of a table, such as the claw, the pillar, or the top, and the lump system is a contract system, by which the parts would not be separated as you mean, but they are separated, inasmuch as the machinery does part, but he contracts for the whole table. It was the lump system that I wanted the men to adopt; I believe that system is not known in the trade as the sweating system; I have explained what I believe to be the sweating system.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Wright*.] Ham was picketing the first week in December.

Re-examined.] I did not make any proposition to the deputation, nor did I authorise them to make any proposition to the men; I did not in any way recognise the right of the society to interfere with our mode of carrying on our business; I told them that it would be a contract between the men and the foreman, and that the workman might consult his bench mates before taking out the contract; we never closed our workshop or factory, except in the sense that we desired to alter the mode in which the men were paid; they were never closed for a moment; the real reason for our making the alteration was to get the best men. Before making the alteration my attention had been called to the cost of labour, and I had reason to believe it was costing too much, that is, in proportion to the articles made; that was not entirely the reason for making the alteration; we wanted better men, that was the main reason; they would not come to work at 9 *d.* per hour, they said they preferred piece-work or lump work. I could see Matthews and the other men on looking out of window: they were constantly walking up and down and disappearing, and going in and out of the public-house; it depended on the weather to a certain extent. I could see sufficiently of them to see that our warehouse was the object of their attention, and one of them, sometimes two, took refuge in a wheelwright's shop in the mews immediately opposite, and used to watch from there when it rained; those men were Weiler and Cavers; at least I believe that is his name.

JOHN BRANNAN LAMBERT STRIDE:—I live in London-street, Fitzroy-square; I am now in the employment of Messrs. Jackson and Graham, and have been so ever since the latter end of last May. In November I was a member of the Alliance Cabinet Makers' Society. I remember the notice which was given by Messrs. Jackson and Graham of their intention to alter the mode of payment. On Saturday, 14th, a meeting was held on the subject at the "King and Queen" public house, at the corner of Foley-street; it was a meeting of the workmen of the firm belonging to the society. Ham was the chairman, Weiler and Reed were present. There was a discussion upon the subject of Messrs. Jackson and Graham's proposed alteration, and an arrangement was made that none of us should go in to work at the factory again until it was announced by the executive committee that the shop should be thrown open again; it was closed until then. We were not to commence work again till we had orders from the executive committee. It was proposed that a deputation should wait on Mr. Graham, to see if he could make arrangements for our coming into work again under the old system. A resolution was passed that we should sign the book each day at the society house, the "King and Queen," between 10 and 12 o'clock in the morning and two and four o'clock in the afternoon, to receive strike pay, that was a guinea a week, the regular strike pay. I heard something said by some of the executive; I won't be certain whether it was the chairman or secretary, about advertising in the different papers, and sending to the different secretaries of the society to block all towns they had correspondence with, to prevent men from being sent to fill our places. I spoke as to my desire of going back and trying the new system, and I was scarcely allowed a hearing. I said there would be other men to take our places from all parts of the country, only too glad to get in if we came out, and that was the answer I received, that they would advertise. After the deputation had waited upon Mr. Graham there was another meeting on the 16th. Mr. Ham took the chair. The matter was discussed by several members, I among the number, and each had a hearing but myself. There was one or two besides that were anxious to go back, but they said they would abide by the decision of the executive committee; that they should like to go back and try it, but they would not if the executive wished them not. Reed was present at that meeting, and I am almost certain Weiler was. One of the members, I can't say which, said, "Had we not better keep some pickets on the outside of the factory to watch the premises; I will go as one," and the chairman remarked, "Don't be in too great a hurry, that will come on very likely by-and-bye; if you listen to me you will wait till you get orders from us." The subject of picketing was discussed among them, but nothing further, as I know of, arranged. On the Tuesday I resigned my membership of the society, and on the Wednesday morning, after breakfast, I went back to my work in Ogle-street, and, except when I have been ill, I have been working there ever since. I did not see any picketing the first day; I did some five or six days after, or it may be a day or two more; I first noticed some men walking up and down outside the window close to the head of my bench, where I could look out and have a view of them all day long; I don't remember who I first saw; it was in Ogle street; my place looks into Ogle-street, facing the church; it was generally after breakfast that I saw them walking up and down; I scarcely ever saw them before breakfast that I remember, and it continued up to 7 o'clock in the evening more or less; our breakfast is at 8 o'clock, we have half an hour; to the best of my recollection I have not seen anybody when I have gone to work in the morning, not to notice them; sometimes it was dark in the morning; this picketing continued as far I was cognisant of it up to the second Tuesday in February, which was the Tuesday prior to my going to the police court on the Thursday; it was about the same each day during the whole of that time, from morning till evening; if I looked out at many different hours I would see them; I have seen from two to four men engaged in this occupation, sometimes two, sometimes three, sometimes four; I have seen all the defendants engaged in it, some more than others, Matthews most; he was there very often, in all weathers; next to Matthews Weiler was most frequently there; I saw Ham one week almost every day, at intervals, being a member of the executive, he was similar to a serjeant walking about to see that the men were on duty; Hibbert was the last I saw there; I saw him the last morning of any; he was walking up and down in the same way; I saw Reed at several intervals, but not very frequently, he was doing the same as the others; I might have seen him before, but I was not aware who he was till I asked, and after that I noticed him; he stopped me one morning as I was going back from breakfast; I can scarcely say which of the defendants I have seen together; I have seen Reed in conversation with the others that were on picket more than once or twice; I have not seen the whole five together that I am aware of; but I have seen Reed with each of them at different times, walking up and down; I have seen several of them together walking up and down, I can scarcely tell which, because I little thought it would come to this, or I should have taken greater notice; when I have seen them, whether together or not, they have been doing the same thing as the others. I have been spoken to by Matthews; on one occasion he followed me into the "Wheatsheaf" public house in Upper Marylebone-street, when I was coming from my work going to my dinner, he followed me along with some of the new hands till he saw where we went, and then he came in and commenced conversation about the work, and who the men were that were with me; he then asked me if I would have a glass of ale with him, I said I had no objection; after that he stood a glass of wine or gin, and he left me at the counter and turned his conversation to the new hands; he tried to influence them, I can't say exactly what

what he said. He persuaded them by all means to come out; as near as I can recollect he said, "Don't you think you are acting very foolish to stay in there and work, when if you come out we can get you other shops as good as that, or better. They said they did not see as they were doing anything detrimental to their cause; they wanted work, they understood that they were giving very good prices, and they had always been used to piece work, therefore they should try it for the present. He then asked me if I could not influence them to come out, and why did I not come round to the society house with him on the next lodge night, and get reinstated to the society again. I said, "I am very well satisfied where I am, I am very comfortable at present, and until I see things take a change, I wish to remain where I am." I told him that all I wanted was good work and to be well paid for it, which I had got at present; he said he was surprised at me after my being a leading man in the society at Bristol as the secretary for some time, setting such a bad example; he wished me to come out and they would support me, and anything in reason that I wanted they would furnish me for coming out; he had got that authority. I still stood to my previous answer; when he was leaving there was another person in the trade with him that I was not acquainted with, and he said, "Mind, I hope I shall see you on the next lodge night. I shall be looking out for you; I shall speak to them about you; we want to get you back again, as you will be useful to us." I did not go. I saw Matthews again a few days after; he frequently spoke to me on the subject; he would follow me; we generally went to this public-house, being the nearest I passed coming towards my home. On one occasion he said to me, "Of course you are aware you will be called a black, go where you will, and you will find that you won't be able to get any work in any shop in London or elsewhere where there is any society of ours held." On one occasion Reed spoke to me as I was coming from my breakfast, and just going into the factory; he beckoned me and said, "How are you getting on inside; how is things looking with the new hands," and while we were in the midst of conversation Mr. Rawlins, one of our foremen, came up, and I went away into the factory. The picketing went on after these conversations just the same as ever.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Hopwood*.] I have been ill for some little time past; we had two meetings at the lodge house, one on the Saturday and one on the Monday after the deputation had seen Mr. Graham. I had not been a member of the society ever since I had been in London, only since I commenced working for Jackson and Graham; I was secretary to the Cabinet-makers' Society at Bristol; it was a society that was understood to protect the interests of the men against the employers. It is generally understood that a man is considered a black if he opposes himself to the rest of the society; I have never treated any so; I never had occasion for it. At the meeting on the Saturday I most emphatically opposed coming out from Jackson and Graham's; I say that on my oath; I did not vote either time there was a division; some went to the right, and some to the left; the side I happened to be sitting, at the right, voted for coming out; I sat there, but I did not vote; I never held up my hands; I did not know they were going to divide; I can't say how many went to the other side of the room; I can't say that one went. I announced on that occasion that I differed from the rest; I had two or three says, and they put me down on each occasion. I heard more than two say they wished to go back; I heard two I am certain besides myself, but there were more than two; I can't say how many were there; all the men that were at work at Jackson and Graham's; I did not go back to work on lump work; I went on at day work for a month or two, finishing the work I had left unfinished.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Crisp*.] When I went back to Jackson and Graham's I found one grown man and two boys, I think, in the shop where I was working; I can't say what work the man was doing; I did not go to look; I was given to understand that he was working day work as usual, but I can't say. It must have been at the latter end of January that I began to work lump work; it was at my own suggestion that I commenced it, because I could make more money; it was no use my suggesting it before; there were the rules of the shop to abide by; when I commenced lump work I did not have a boy working under me; I had my son with me; he is almost big enough to be a man; he is between 16 and 17; he would be called a lad in the warehouse. I can't say whether having a lad working under you is called the "sweating" system; I should not consider it so myself; I can't answer for my fellow-workmen. I remember when piece-work, at lump prices, was commenced at Jackson and Graham's; there is a distinction between lump work and piece work at lump prices; that commenced as soon as the new hands came on; there was a lot of work to be finished, but the new hands generally had new jobs given to them. I can't tell you any one of them; there were several strangers to me, and they were got out again by the pickets. The lump work began immediately the fresh men came on; I was at day work finishing my jobs; the men who tried to get me away did not know what system I was on; of course they were given to understand that the lump system would be the system for the future, and so it will be.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Wright*.] It was both in November and December that I had these conversations with Matthews. I had conversation with him on several occasions; the last I have spoken to was in December.

GODFREY WILLIAMS PARRY:—I became Foreman of the cabinet shop of Messrs. Jackson and Graham in Upper Ogle-street on 5th August 1873; that was when I entered

entered the service. I continued to be foreman down to November 1874; up to that time the men were paid by the hour. It was my place as foreman to see that the work was done; I found that it was not done in accordance with my requirements. On 13th November a notice was given of an alteration in the mode of payment. On the morning of the 16th, when the new system was to commence, one man came to work; the two boys were in. On the Thursday, I think I saw all the old workmen; they came to take their tools away. I don't remember any fresh men presenting themselves for employment during that week. I think Stride came back on the Wednesday, but I am not positive; he continued to work; he was paid by the hour for five or six weeks, as he was finishing some work. I first noticed the picketing on the Monday, 23rd November. I am not quite certain which of the defendants were picketing that first week. I saw men walking up down from about eight o'clock in the morning until about five o'clock in the evening; there were generally two, sometimes three. Some fresh men presented themselves in the week commencing the 23rd; I think one man called that week and arranged to come in on the following Monday morning. He did come at six o'clock and remained till one o'clock, when he went to dinner; he then returned and took away his tools. I don't know his name; at that time the picketing had commenced. I dare say about half a dozen men came in the week beginning on the 23rd, some of them brought in their tools, and some did not come in at all; I don't know the names of those that brought their tools in and took them out again, because the names were not taken. I saw some of the men that applied for work spoken to by the persons that were picketing outside; about three out of the six brought in their tools and took them away again. I don't know that I saw those three spoken to, but they told me what had happened. The first week after the notice was given scarcely anybody applied for work, and no systematic picketing was resorted to; but the week following it commenced. In the week beginning 30th November some fresh hands came in; I think Peter Gilliard was the first that came in, but I am not quite positive which week he commenced; the system of the shop was explained to him, and he accepted the terms; it was piece work, at lump prices; he is working there still; I have not seen him spoken to by men outside. The next man engaged, I think, was Tame; he is working up to the present time; I am not quite positive whether he came in that week; Duck, H. Brown, and Baker, I think, came in that week; they are still in the service on piece work, lump prices. I noticed the persons outside during these weeks; they were there all day. I have seen all the defendants there from time to time; this continued down to 11th February, when they were taken into custody. I found a difficulty in getting men to come in; the men were walking up and down in front of the premises; that was all that I personally saw them doing; it continued all day, from about eight o'clock in the morning till about five o'clock in the afternoon; there were generally two, sometimes three; I have seen a greater number than that outside the factory, but I could not say they were picketing; by "picketing," I mean watching the premises with the intention of preventing men coming to seek for work. I saw Matthews for about three weeks or more picketing in company with another person. Ham I saw, I think, for a week. I am not positive whether Reed was there more than a fortnight, and I am not positive whether the two weeks were consecutive. Weiler I saw about three weeks, some weeks were consecutive, and Hibbert I observed about two weeks at the end of the picketing. I can't positively state the number of men that came for employment from 23rd November to 11th February, but I should imagine about 20 or 30, who did not come in to work; somewhere between 20 and 30 did come in to work, but some left; I distinctly remember two leaving; that is three altogether. I did not know that they were going to leave before they left; they did not finish the work on which they were engaged. After the defendants were in custody new hands applied for work; we had no difficulty in getting hands after that, after the picketing had ceased, and they continued to work on the contract system, at lump prices. Since the picketing ceased, I do not remember an instance of a man leaving without finishing his work; whilst the picketing existed one or two men made complaints to me, one in particular, Clark.

Cross-examined by Mr. *Hopwood*.] I did not see any of our old workmen in the street, I am glad to say; they were too much of gentlemen to come and watch the place. I will swear I did not see many; I may have seen one or two. Since we have had the new system we have had some men go away; I only remember three leaving of their own accord.

HENRY BROWN:—I live in Sherborne-street, and am a Cabinet-maker. I have been working at Messrs. Jackson and Graham's five or six months; I went there in the latter part of December. I remember seeing persons watching outside the factory in Ogle-street; some of them have spoken to me; I don't know them; they were picketing there. I have seen Matthews; he spoke to me once, before I went into the service; it was in a public-house. I was asked to go there by a man I don't know, and Matthews was there; he spoke to the other man; he persuaded me not to go in; he said, "Do you know that you are doing wrong by going there?" I said, "I don't know that I am doing wrong." He said, "Well, I can inform you that you are; have you taken out a job at a price?" I said, I had got a price that was satisfactory to me; he said, he did not think it would last. He did not deny but what I had got a good price by what I said, but he did not think I should maintain it. Something was said to me about what would happen after the

the strike was over; that was not said by Matthews. I can't say whether he was present; he was in the house, in front of the bar. I was in a private room with 10 or a dozen men; I can't say who they were; the man who brought me to Matthews was one of them; they were men that had been in Matthews' company. I had seen one or two of them picketing four or five times. Matthews was in and out of the room; the man that first spoke to me I have seen picketing, but I have not seen him since; he was alone, acting as a picket, when he spoke to me. I have told you all that took place with Matthews with one exception; he said he would make it answer my purpose to come out; that's all; he said if I worked along with society men, I should be affected in some way; I should not be thought so much of as they were. I don't know what society men are more than me; I am a non-society man; I reckon so; society men are a lot of men combining together, I suppose; I have been followed by the men who were picketing, I might say, every night in the week; I have been accompanied, I could not say followed, as far as Gower-street and King's Cross on my way home, and I was spoken to by a man named Cavers, one of the men who were picketing. (Mr. Hawkins proposed to ask what Cavers said. Mr. Harris objected, there being no proof that he was engaged in the alleged conspiracy. Mr. Baron Cleasby considered the evidence admissible, on the ground that Cavers was seen acting in concert with Reed; if two persons were together doing an act which bore the character of watching and besetting, what each did was evidence against all, and what Cavers said here, was in reality an act done by him.) We walked partly home together, and discussed different matters about business and about the shop, and he persuaded me to come out, and told me of the consequence; he said if I went into a society shop, I should not get a job and should not stay there; the picketing did not prevent my going out, but I would not go out on account of it; I did not wish to be bothered about it; it made it unpleasant for me to go out, and that was why I kept in.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hopwood.] I worked at Mr. Dyer's in Northampton-street before I went to Jackson and Graham's; I left Dyer's; they did not complain of my conduct; I was not offered better wages at Jackson and Graham's; I did not get better; I really left for the sake of change.

WILLIAM HINES:—I live in Gray's Inn-road, and am Cabinet-maker. I went to work for Messrs. Jackson and Graham last November (before that I was working at Dyer's, in Essex-road, Islington). I went to work on piece-work at lump prices. I saw Matthews the same week I went there; he was alone in Ogle-street about 6 o'clock in the evening; as I was leaving work, he was at the corner of Ogle Mews and Ogle-street; he spoke to me, and asked me the reason I worked in the shop; I told him I went and got work there; I and Gilliard were together; we walked on, and Matthews followed us to the corner of Howland-street, Tottenham Court-road; that would be about 200 or 250 yards; he did not speak to us as we were walking, but before he left he asked us if we would come out of the shop; I said I would not under present circumstances; he offered me money to come out, the same as I was getting at Jackson and Graham's; I had not told him what I was getting there; he said he would like me to come round to the society house, that is, the "King and Queen" public-house; I said no, I did not care about it; he said I should be thought by the society a black sheep if I went to work, if I went to work in any of the principal towns in England, or in London, and I should not be able to get work; he has spoken to me several times after that, at times alone, and at times when he has been in company with men who are not here; I don't know their names; he has merely offered me money to come out. I have seen persons walking up and down opposite the factory; that has been going on days and days at a time, from the time I first went to work, up to the 11th February, when they were prosecuted; I have seen, I should think, three or four on an average, walking up and down, from 8 o'clock in the morning till 7 o'clock in the evening; I have noticed Matthews, Hibbert, and Weiler doing that; I have seen Ham there, but not from 8 till 7 o'clock; I have seen him walk up and down the street, that is all; neither of the others, none of the defendants besides Matthews, have spoken to me; Matthews mentioned Stride to me, and said that he was a black sheep among the flock. I know Cavers; I have seen him with the others walking up and down from 8 a.m. till evening; I don't know that I have seen him in company with Matthews; I have seen him picketing up and down Ogle-street, from Foley-street to Marylebone-street, for the whole day, in company with a man whose name I don't know; I have not seen him in company with either of the defendants that I know of; when Matthews followed me to the top of Albany-street he said he would like to have Stride there, and see him hung; Gilliard was with me; I did not like this, being spoken to every time I went in and out of the shop.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hopwood.] I left Dyer's perhaps a week before the last and witness; about eight or ten of us left, and I went to Jackson and Graham's; Dyer had about 300 workmen.

Cross-examined by Mr. Harris.] I have been in the cabinet-making some time; I have heard the term "black sheep" used in the trade; I had no occasion to write down what was said to me; I had a subpoena to attend on the 5th; I can't tell you the name of the man who came; he did not put any questions to me; he did not suggest the term "black sheep" to me; I gave my statement according as I heard it from the men themselves; I have a good memory; I had my subpoena yesterday; that was not the first time I was

seen about it; I was before the Grand Jury last sessions; that was the first time I heard of coming before anybody; I heard of the proceedings before the magistrate the second time, and I went to hear what they had got to say. I was not called as a witness. I was not spoken to there about it; it was at the shop afterwards. I had a half-holiday to go to the police court, and I had to pay for it. I was spoken to before the case began here; somebody asked if I knew anything about it. I did not say they called me a black sheep; I said that they said I should be a black sheep if I did not come out of the shop. I never had any conversation with Mr. Oliver about it, or with Mitchell; perhaps I might have mentioned it to my foreman; he did not suggest the term black sheep to me; I had no conversation with him about the case till I was brought up as a witness; I can't say who I first mentioned it to; I don't know that I mentioned it to anybody before the solicitor; I have not overdrawn at Jackson and Graham's that I know of; I don't think I have; I have never been spoken to about it.

Re-examined.] Gilliard was present when Matthews said I should be thought a black sheep. I made my statement voluntarily to the solicitor at Jackson and Graham's; he put one or two questions to me, and I answered him. No one else was present, nor was I present, when any other witness's statement was taken. I worked at Dyer's at piece-work at lump prices; none of the defendants worked there that I know of; they were strangers to me.

PETER GILLIARD:—I live at 8, Caledonian-road, and am a Cabinet-maker. I am a native of Guernsey. I entered the employment of Jackson and Graham on 19th November; before that I was working at Guernsey; I had never been in London before. I do not belong to any society or trade union. I did not know of any of the defendants. I went into the shop in Ogle-street on 19th November, and have continued there till now; between the 19th and 23rd November I saw several men watching the premises; I can't tell who they were; I was spoken to by Matthews. I saw him on two or three nights about four days after I had been there; he was in Ogle-street from 5 o'clock to 5.30 as I was leaving work; he was standing still; I had to pass him; he asked me to come out; I said I would not; he said if I did not it would be all the worse for me, that they should win the day and the society men be sure to go back; he said he would give me the same amount I was earning if I would come out; that they would find me another shop, or pay me my expenses back home again; Hines was with me; another night I was spoken to by three men; I do not know them; I had seen men in the street, outside the factory, walking up and down, watching the men come out. I saw them there pretty well every hour of the day; that continued pretty well up to Christmas, or past Christmas, I can't say; I think it ceased near about the time when the men were taken up by the detectives; I could not say that I have seen any of the defendants watching the place to get the men out. I did not see them many times, about four men were usually in company. Hines was with me when Matthews spoke to me again; he asked us near about the same thing, and if we had altered our mind; he had followed us from the factory to Howland-street; it was after leaving work at 5 o'clock; it was about two or three nights after the other conversation; he asked us if we were cabinet-makers; we said, "Yes;" he said, "You work at Jackson and Graham's, don't you?" I said, "Yes;" he asked if there was a man named Stride working in the shop; I said, "Yes;" he said, "Do you know that he was a society man?" I said, "Yes, he has told me so;" he said, "He has left the society on account of this affair; he is no man, he is a black sheep, and I should like to see him hung;" he said that we had better come out of the shop, that we should be sure to turn out, and the society men would go back, and we should stand no chance at all; that they could not get men enough to work in the firm from any part of London; he said he would see us on another night to see if we agreed to come out, and we were to go and tell him at the society house, in Ogle-street; he said he would give me the same amount of money and keep me till I got work, and find me another workshop to work in. I said I would not listen to any of them, that I should work on my own opinion, and stop there as long as I could. I did not go to the lodge house at all; I was spoken to by three men the next night, who asked me near about the same thing. I was spoken to three or four times altogether; on coming from the factory I saw persons in the street watching the premises, every night pretty well; I do not know who they were; I felt rather uneasy about it for a little time.

REGINALD CORSLAND CLARKE:—I am a Cabinet-maker, and live at 8, Crown Court, Soho. I am working for Messrs. Jackson and Graham, and have been since about 27th November last. I have noticed persons outside the factory, two or three at a time, sometimes more; sometimes leaning against the lamp post facing the factory, sometimes walking up and down, from about eight o'clock in the morning till five o'clock in the evening; this was the case every day; I saw them speak to several of the men going in and out. I went in on the Friday, and I was spoken to on the Monday following by Matthews; he asked me if I was working at Jackson and Graham's; I said, "Yes;" he asked if I was working day work or piece work; I told him I was working day work at that time; he said it was a pity it could not be altered; that was all he said; several others that were picketing have spoken to me and persuaded me to leave my work unfinished and bring my chest out, but not the defendants. I had seen Matthews there before he spoke to me, walking up and down with others; Flackey and Charley were two of those that spoke to me,

me, those are their Christian names. I went on piece work from seven to eight days after I went there. I was spoken to after that, my contract was unfinished when Flackey and Charley asked me to bring away my tools; I had seen them before that walking up and down at the corner. I can't say that I saw them with Matthews. I have not been spoken to by men that I have seen in company with the defendants. I have seen all the five defendants walking up and down between eight o'clock and five o'clock, up to the time they were apprehended, not together, separately, walking up down. I generally used to work till seven o'clock, because I did not like passing in and out, it upset me so, to see some of them grinning so much; I should have left earlier but for that; I made a complaint to the foreman.

[Adjourned.]

Thursday, 6th May 1875.

HERBERT WOODROW:—I am living at 27, Longford-street, Regent's Park; I am a cabinet-maker. I am working for Messrs. Jackson and Graham at the Ogle-street factory. I commenced work there about 12 or 15 months ago, and worked there at 9d. per hour up to 13th November, when the change of system was proposed. I was a member of the Cabinet-makers' Association. I attended the meetings before and after the deputation waited on Mr. Graham. I know the defendants; they were all present at the first meeting after the strike on the Monday morning. Ham, Reed, and Weiler are members of the executive. On the strike taking place I came out from working; I attended about three meetings after the strike; there was one on the Tuesday, the 17th. I was not present at any meeting when the question of picketing was discussed. I passed the Ogle-street factory once or twice after the 24th November. I saw some men watching the premises as I went to the "King and Queen," where the society met, to sign my name every Tuesday night (I was receiving strike pay), that is about 400 or 500 yards from the factory. I found most of the members of the society there; about 40 had left the shop. The secretary of the West End branch was there, and one or two of the executive committee. I have seen some of the defendants there on different occasions, Weiler, and Reed, and Ham. In going through Ogle-street, whilst receiving strike pay, I noticed men walking backwards and forwards near the factory several times in the morning. We had to sign the book once a day before twelve; those on strike signed in red ink, and those only out of work in black ink. I succeeded in getting a job about three or four days after the strike for about fourteen days, and then I left the job and was out of work again for a week or a fortnight. During that time I noticed persons walking backwards and forwards in front of the factory, one or two at a time; I have not seen more than two. I have seen all the defendants there walking to and fro; this continued up to February. About 23rd December I returned to the firm and applied for a job, and received one at piece work, lump prices. I accepted that employment whilst I was a member of the association. After they heard that I had accepted a job, and was about to resume work, Weiler came to my lodging and asked me not to resume work until the strike was finished, and I consented to stay away, I believe a week and more; I received 17. strike pay for that week, and Weiler said there was more money coming to me. They were to try on the Tuesday night to see whether they could not bring the strike to an end. On the Wednesday morning I met Weiler; he said that they had had a meeting, and they wished me to stay away longer; I said I did not wish to stay away longer; I wished to resume work. They offered me more money to stay away; 9d. an hour for 9½ hours, the same as I was receiving from the firm. Then there was the 17. paid me. He told me I was to sign the book again, which I did. I did not on that occasion see any person in the street outside the factory; it was about 10 o'clock in the morning. I had no further communication with Weiler after that. I resumed work about 11th January. I did not withdraw from the society. I did not see either of the defendants after I went back to work. On going to and from the factory afterwards I saw persons in the street walking backwards and forwards, sometimes two, sometimes one. I did not see them speak to anyone. I saw all the defendants except Reed and Ham; they were not there when I went at 6 a.m. I have seen them there at seven o'clock, and the whole of the day till six p.m. I had told Weiler before receiving the 9d. an hour that I was going to resume work; he asked on what conditions; I said at piece-work, as was given out when we were discharged. At that time I had not made any agreement to go back. I do not know where either of the defendants worked. Nothing disagreeable to me has ever been done by the persons in the street as I went to and from my work.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hopwood.] When I went to receive my strike pay there were a good many men there receiving strike pay; I met six, seven, or eight of my old mates there.

Cross-examined by Mr. Harris.] Since I resumed work I saw all the defendants except Reed and Ham walking up and down. I resumed work about 11th January. I don't think I have seen Matthews walking up and down since Christmas. One evening, about 6.30, I believe the Tuesday before they were apprehended, Matthews came and called me out of the shop. He was not acting as picket.

Re-examined.] He said, "How many benches are there in the shop?" I told him the number, and he said that was all right. I said, "Is that all you want me for?" He said "Yes," and away he went.

MATTHEW BROWN:—I am a cabinet-maker. Previous to November last I was working at Mr. Lucraft's, in Murray-street, New North Road, at piece-work. In consequence of an advertisement, I went to Messrs. Jackson and Graham's factory in Ogle-street. I went on 1st December, about three o'clock in the afternoon. I noticed Matthews marching up and down outside the door. I went in and saw the foreman, and agreed to go to work on piece-work. On coming out I saw Matthews walking up and down; he asked me to go and have something to drink. We went to the "York Minster." He said that the men had turned out of the shop because they could not agree about the price of the work, or something of that kind, and asked me not to go in, and he would give me 35s. a week while I was out of work. I said I would not go in. He said he would give me 5s. down for my expenses that afternoon, which he did, and I went off. I did not receive any other money. I did not see any of the other defendants. About a fortnight afterwards I altered my mind and went to the factory, saw the foreman and took in my tools. That was about 12 o'clock in the day. I saw Matthews walking up and down. I did not see anyone with him. He did not speak to me then; I saw him the next week outside the factory, and he asked me to refund the 5s., and I did so; he said no more; I continued to work up to the present time; from the time I went in, I saw four or five men outside the factory walking up and down from about 7 a.m. till 7 o'clock at night. I recognise Reed; I have seen him in company with other men walking up and down outside. A man named Cavers spoke to me outside one Saturday morning; he spoke to me several times and greatly annoyed me; he was the principal man that annoyed me after I went into work; he was one of the men walking up and down.

Cross-examined by Mr. Hopwood.] I said I went in at piece-work, not at lump prices.

GEORGE HENRY BAKER:—I am a cabinet-maker; previous to November I was working at Dyer's, at lump-work; I went to Jackson and Graham's to seek employment; to the best of my recollection some time in November, I could not swear to the date. I saw the foreman. I went to work on the Friday, and have continued there up to the present time; on the Saturday after I went in I saw some men in the street, picketing, watching the premises; I have generally seen two or three, from about 8 a.m. till 5 o'clock; I recognise all the defendants as having been there; this continued till the commencement of this prosecution; none of the defendants spoke to me in the street; on the Saturday as I commenced work on the Friday, Matthews spoke to me in the Wheat-sheaf in Great Marylebone-street; he asked me if I knew that I was doing the men who were out an injury, and likewise doing myself an injury in working there against them; he asked if I would discontinue working there, and why I left Dyer's, as I was pretty comfortable there; I said to better myself; he asked if I would come out; I said no; he asked if anything would induce me to come out; I said no; other persons were present, but not the prisoners; I knew some of them to be cabinet-makers, and they said in Matthews' hearing that I should be blacked, and should not get a job anywhere if I continued working there. I was spoken to again between a week and a fortnight afterwards by Matthews at another public-house at the corner of Ogle-street, kept by Tennant; it was on the same subject; he asked if I still meant to keep at work where I was, and I said, "Yes"; a man named Rawlins, belonging to the firm, came in and the conversation dropped, and I walked out; nothing occurred to me on leaving work from the men who were picketing.

Cross-examined by Mr. Harris.] Matthews was within hearing when the men spoke about my being blacked.

JAMES TAME:—I am a cabinet-maker; I went to work at Jackson and Gratham's about four weeks before Christmas at piece-work; I had come from Marlboro'; this was the first time I was in London; I have continued in the service up to the present time; I first noticed men in the street on the Monday as I went in on the Saturday; I think it was one man, I believe Matthews; he was walking up and down outside; I noticed persons walking up and down outside, and occasionally accosting men that came there for work; up to the time of the men being taken into custody, as a rule I saw about two almost all the day; I recognise the defendants as having seen them outside, doing what I have described; Matthews has, certainly; he spoke to me on the Monday after I went in; he asked whether I intended to stop in; I said, "Yes, certainly;" and I think I said I had seen some of his friends the day before (Sunday), and they had tried to persuade me to come out, but I intended to stop and stick to my resolution that I had given them. He did not say anything more; I suppose he thought that sufficient; I don't know that this walking up and down affected me particularly, it was rather amusing sometimes.

WILLIAM SMART:—I am a cabinet-maker; I went in to work at Jackson and Graham's on 28th December; I had been working at Winchester before that; I went to

see

see the foreman in the afternoon; I saw some men in street; I could not say distinctly how many; they were walking up and down; as I came out one of them spoke to me; I went into work on the following day, and from that time up to 11th February, when the men were taken into custody, I noticed persons in the street, on each working day; I saw them stopping persons and asking them their business; I do not recognise any of the defendants as being there or speaking to me; I was spoken to three or four times; the effect of the picketing upon me was that I was sorry to think I had come there to work; I tried to keep out of the way, to get away from their speaking to me; it did not make me alter my time of leaving, but I went by a different way.

EDWARD MARCHANT:—I am a cabinet-maker; I entered the employment of Jackson and Graham in February, I can't tell the date, perhaps a fortnight before the defendants were taken into custody; I applied for work about nine o'clock in the morning; I noticed two or three men in the street at that time walking about; they spoke to me before I went in; I recognise Weiler as one of the persons I saw walking up and down in front of the factory from time to time; I saw persons doing this at dinner time, and in the evening sometimes, when I went into work and when I came out; I do not know any of them besides Weiler; two or three spoke to me; Weiler spoke to me the first time I went in to ask for work; he told me I was not to go to work there, that I should not get any work anywhere else in London if I went to work there; I said that did not matter, I wanted to go to work there because my father was at work in Oxford-street; he offered me 27s. a week not to go; he spoke to me again two or three days afterwards, and told me not to go to work there, and they would find me another shop; I said I did not want to go anywhere else.

RICHARD CARR:—I am a French polisher; I entered the service of Jackson and Graham about two and a-half years ago; I was in their employment at the time of the strike in November; I did not go out or cease to work; the cabinet-makers went out; I have continued to work there up to the present time; I work from 6 o'clock to 5.30; I have noticed men outside the factory on working days from the week after the strike commenced up to the time the men were taken into custody; I sometimes saw two men, sometimes three, different men; they were there from 7.30 or 8 o'clock until about 7 p.m.; I have not seen them speak to any of the men; I recognise all the defendants as having been there.

BENJAMIN JEWELL:—I am a cabinet-maker; I was at work for Jackson and Graham at the time of the strike; I was there ten days before the strike commenced; previous to 16th November I was working day work, 8d. an hour; I continued to work there after the strike; I did not know any of the defendants before the strike; I saw them shortly after the strike; I saw several persons standing outside the factory; I did not go out to breakfast; I saw them at dinner time and occasionally in the evening; I have seen some of the defendants there, I can't say that I have seen them all, they were standing about; they have not spoken to me; I have occasionally seen them speak to men, I don't know what it was for; I am not aware that any one has spoken to me at any time in the defendants' hearing; I recognise four of the defendants, not Weiler.

Mr. Harris applied that two witnesses, whose names were on the back of the Bill, should be put into the box for cross-examination.

Mr. Besley declined to call them, as he had proved the facts by other witnesses.

Mr. Baron Cleasby did not think the prosecution were bound to call them, although it was a course generally recommended.

Mr. Hopwood desired to know on what counts the prosecution relied.

After some discussion, Mr. Baron Cleasby expressed a strong opinion that the 8th and 9th counts were those to which the evidence pointed, and upon which the prosecution must rely.

Mr. Harris submitted that there was no evidence of any attempt to coerce either the masters or the men.

Mr. Baron Cleasby considered the case must go to the Jury. And in leaving it to the Jury he observed that the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871 made it an offence to molest or obstruct any person with a view to coerce him; mere molestation and obstruction would not do, it must be with a view to coerce either the workman to quit his employment, or the master to alter the mode of carrying on his business. Molestation or obstruction was defined in the Act to be amongst other things, a persistent following a workman about from place to place, and as regards the master, a watching or besetting his place of business; those were the offences pointed out by the 8th and 9th counts, and it would be for the Jury to say whether the evidence made out those offences as against the defendants.

GUILTY—One Month's Imprisonment each.

SUMMING-UP.

(TRANSCRIPT of the NOTES of the learned JUDGE'S SUMMING-UP, taken by Messrs. Barnett & Buckler, Shorthand Writers to the Court.)

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—Gentlemen of the Jury, the five prisoners at the bar are indicted for conspiracy, which is an important branch of the criminal law, and applies to different matters, from conspiracy to injure the State, which would be high treason, to conspiracy to injure individuals. And there is one peculiarity, I may say, which belongs to the description of conspiracy, and makes it different from other charges, which is this: in other charges the intention to do an act, although it be a criminal act, is not of itself a crime; it is not a crime until something is done which amounts either to the doing the thing, or the attempting to do it. In a case of conspiracy it is different. In a case of conspiracy the crime consists in the agreement or confederacy to do the thing; the crime is committed whether the thing is done or not. One is very often obliged to get at the fact of a conspiracy by seeing what several persons have done, but in reality the offence consists in the agreement, which is called conspiracy; for instance, there might be a conspiracy to set London on fire in a hundred different places, but the offence would be wanting if it stopped there, and you could not stop the persons till they had actually begun to do it. But the crime here is in the agreement and confederacy.

Now one particular branch of this law has occupied a great deal of attention lately, and that is the branch relating to the connection between the employers and the working classes. There has been a good deal of legislation upon that; that legislation has consisted in passing Acts of Parliament, and repealing and passing others, which no doubt has introduced a great deal of difficulty. We have now a very valuable report, which has been referred to by the learned counsel, embracing this subject amongst others, and to which the Lord Chief Justice, as well as the Recorder, were parties, recognising the difficulty of the question, the imperfect nature of the legislation on the subject, and suggesting, at all events, some amendments. In the present case it appears to me, that we escape many of the legal difficulties which might beset this question of conspiracy. If they had arisen I would not have decided them, but I would have reserved them for the consideration of the rest of the Judges. But the question in the present case, as it was opened by the learned counsel for the prosecution, depends really upon the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1871; and the present case brings before you a question of fact, which you will have to consider, and not any question of law for me to decide. That Act makes it an offence to molest or obstruct any person with a view to coerce him. Mere molestation and obstruction will not do it; it is to molest or obstruct him with a view to coerce him; if he is a workman, to quit an employment that he is engaged in, to coerce him to that; or if he is a master, to coerce him to alter the mode of carrying on his business.

Two of the counts of this indictment are directed to these cases, coercing the master, and coercing the workmen; coercing the master to alter the mode of carrying on his business, by not continuing to employ men at lump prices instead of day work; and coercing the workmen to leave the employment they are engaged in.

But this is positive, that the molestation or obstruction is not left in a general way for you or me to consider what is a sufficient molestation or obstruction; but it is defined in the Act of Parliament what is such a molestation or obstruction as may bring a person within the pale of this indictment; that is, if it is done with a view to coerce, as it is defined and explained afterwards, passing by other matters which have no bearing whatever on the present question, such as, if he persistently follow about from place to place, that would be regarded as a molestation of a workman, persistently following him about.

Mr. *Harris*.—In a disorderly manner.

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—No, nothing of the sort. If he persistently follow such person about from place to place, that is a molestation or obstruction within the meaning of the Act; if he hide his tools, clothes, or other property, that is a molestation within the Act. There is no reference to any violence offered to him at all. But then we come to the third part, which is the matter relied upon here in the present indictment; because what is said to be persistently following a person about from place to place, is not the following them once or twice, or for a short time; that would not go to the extent of satisfying those words; but the next part is, if he watches or besets the house or place where such person works or carries on his business, or the approach to such house or place. Then follow words which have no bearing upon the present case: "Or, if with two or more other persons he follow such person in a disorderly manner in the street or road"; that is quite a different thing from following a man, vexing him, from place to place.

Therefore,

Therefore, gentlemen, you will have to consider in the present case, whether it is made out to your satisfaction that the present defendants did watch or beset the premises of Messrs. Jackson and Graham, which were premises where the workmen worked, and where they carried on their business, or the approach to it, with a view to coerce them or him; with a view to coerce the employers, Messrs. Jackson and Graham, to change their mode of carrying on their business; or, with a view to coerce the workmen to quit their employment. To sum it up, therefore, molestation or obstruction, by watching and besetting, is that made out? And is it made out that that was done by them with a view to coerce either the employers or the men?

Those who appear here for the prosecution, state their case in this way: Messrs. Jackson and Graham have carried on their business in Oxford-street, and they have a factory in Ogle-street. On the 13th of November they changed their system at Ogle-street from day work to lump work, and it is said that they gave notice to the men that if they returned on the Monday, they must return on lump work, or not return at all—they discharged them in that sense—they did not discharge them out and out, but they said, "If you don't take on lump work, it is no use coming at all, because we won't employ you on day work any more."

I must say that I think too much has been made of that word "robbed." Perhaps it would have been better not to have made use of such a word. Persons do make use of that word when they think they have been losers; Jackson and Graham thought that at day work they did not get what they were entitled to, and Mr. Graham made use of that word.

On the 16th of November, Monday, 40 men leave; Messrs. Jackson and Graham advertise for men, not only in London, but in the country; and men do come; some go into their employment and some not; some go into the employment and go away again, and afterwards return. But here is the part of the case which you will have to consider when I read to you the evidence; they put their case in this way, that from that time, in order to prevent them from getting workmen, their premises in Ogle-street and the approach to them, were watched and beset, and persons going there, apparently workmen, were watched and spoken to, and persuaded, and urged, and paid not to work for them, and to some extent, according to the evidence, some threats were made use of.

Now the threatening is not part of the charge at all. The only way in which any threat, of which there is certainly not much evidence, is material at all, is with a view to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the other question; not the question of molestation, but the question of coercion, with a view to coercion. This continued up to the middle of February, they say, the men you see having been discharged on the 16th November, and then in the middle of February it is still going on, not diminishing, but continuing until that time, a period of nearly three months. They then appeal to the law to put a stop to it, because, they say the law has been violated, and their premises have been watched and beset with a view to coerce them in the mode of carrying on their business. They bring before you the case to show that the several prisoners at the bar, as to whom, certainly, there is not much distinction in general, were concerned in this conspiracy. The real question arises as to their right to do what they did. The defendants, I will call them, as they have been called defendants hitherto, it is proved were present at the meetings, and, as to some of them, there were offers of money, and the use of certain threats; but principally there was walking up and down during the whole of this time, from November to February, more or less, standing opposite to the premises, and accosting the persons who were going in and coming out, and making use of certain language to them. Then they reason from that, that there is sufficient upon the evidence to show you that this was done, in such a manner and under such circumstances, that the fair conclusion is that it was done with a view to coerce Messrs. Jackson and Graham, and the workmen whom they saw. On the contrary, the prisoners' representatives here say that the presence in the street near the premises is not to be properly considered in the nature of watching and besetting, and they rather reason upon this, which is the principal question, as it appears to me, that you will have to consider, that it is not made out sufficiently to your satisfaction that what was done was done by them really with a view to coerce. As to this, you know you have had the definition of the word, and dictionaries and cases have been referred to. I am sure I should only introduce confusion into the case if I was to refer to the authorities. All I can do is to tell you what I consider to be the law upon the subject, and as to which I do not feel myself that I entertain sufficient doubt upon this sort of question upon which I could reserve any case. I don't think you can exactly define the word "coerce." Juries have certain knowledge, and they must apply that knowledge to see what the word connected with the context means. I don't think any Judge or anybody can exactly define the word so as to make it clear where mere persuasion or reasoning would end and coercion and intimidation begin; for instance, coercion of the person is one thing, that may be by force, or it may be by fear. If a person is afraid to leave his house because he is afraid of being shot if he leaves it, or of being punished in any way, he is coerced in his person, but there is no violence offered to him in that case; but his mind is influenced; fear operates on his mind, and he is influenced in such a way as to deprive him of free action. His mind is so acted upon that he cannot leave his house, and so without any force he is actually coerced in his person, and by that means he is deprived of all power. Now coercion of a person, as to the coercion of his mind and will as to the mode of carrying on his business, certainly the Act of Parliament seems to assume that there may be a molesta-

tion or obstruction, by watching and besetting so as to coerce, because it makes that limitation. It makes it an offence if he do this act, which is one of them, if he watch or beset a house or a place where such person resides, or works, or carries on business, with a view to coerce. You see, therefore, gentlemen, it is a possible case, at all events, that that may be done with a view to coercion. That coercion of the mind would appear to be the doing something which, either by threats or by other conduct, is intended to, and calculated to, create some fear of loss, or it may be of ruin, and so acts upon the mind and deprives it of free action, takes away the liberty of the will, and in that way coerces it. It is something done which is calculated or intended, either by some influence of that sort, fear or loss it may generally be, it might be the fear of injury of a sort, to prevent a person from exercising his free will on the subject, and so make him act under coercion.

Now picketing, that is, watching and speaking to persons as they come in and go out, there is no doubt that that may, under certain circumstances, not be unlawful, as you have been told. It is quite plain that watching to see that there are not men at work who are receiving their strike pay is perfectly legitimate, to whatever extent that watching is carried, if it is not with a view to coerce, but with a view to prevent fraud, or, to make use of the same term which has been made use of, robbery. That shows that their being there, and using the language of persuasion to persons that they met, would not necessarily be unlawful, plainly so; but the question is, was the watching and besetting carried on in such a manner and to such an extent that it would be expected to, and might, operate on the will by annoyance or apprehension of loss, or was it so intended; was it done with that view, that is, with a view to coerce, operating on the mind by the apprehension of the will?

Suppose, for the sake of argument (of course it is not the present case at all), but suppose it was proved that the confederacy met, and had come to an arrangement to make it impossible for Messrs. Jackson and Graham to carry on their business, we will say, in the way they pleased, to accost the persons who came there, to offer them money, and so on, so as to make it impossible for them to carry on their business, and that that was done in such a manner that you could not help saying that it was done with a view to coerce them. Of course we have not any evidence of that sort here; the question as it appears to me, lays the burden on the prosecution to show that that which was done is not capable of one meaning or another. It is for them to show to your satisfaction that there was a watching and besetting of these premises, and that that was done in such a manner and under such circumstances, and was so intended, to have the effect of coercing Messrs. Jackson and Graham in the mode of carrying on their business. That is, of course, the principal question, and you will have to consider the evidence, and say how far in your opinion that is made out. If you find that two persons are in a position of antagonism to each other, that is, the employer and these persons, and that they were really contending which might get the upper hand, which could hold out the longest (the men have said, you know, "We will beat the employers; we will make them come to our terms"), it will be for you to form your conclusion whether anything of that sort took place in the present case; it is for you to consider how far the evidence goes.

There are five men at the bar who are charged with this offence. Very little has been said as to the particular evidence applied to each, so as to make any difference between them. I find that fifteen witnesses have been called altogether, and as to each of those witnesses, nine or ten spoke more or less as to each of the prisoners. I have made an abstract of the evidence, and I find, as regards Hibbert, nine witnesses speak to his being seen about the premises and various places, either at the meetings at the public-house or elsewhere. As to Weiler, there are ten. As to Reed, there are ten. As to Ham, nine, and as to Matthews there are more, of course, because there is more said about Matthews than about the others; fourteen witnesses speak to Matthews. You will be able to calculate the effect of their evidence as I go into the matter further, which I must do.

Mr. Graham was the first witness who was called. It is quite unnecessary to read the introductory part of his evidence, because I have already mentioned it to you. After saying that he gave the notice, he told you what took place upon the 16th. He says, on the 16th, only one man and two boys were at work. He was requested on the 16th to see a deputation, and they came; two of them were Ham and Reed. "Reed asked if we were prepared to alter the terms; we want to have the price determined by a shop committee." I said, "No." I was asked if the idea had entered into my head of not getting workmen, I said, "No." I don't think you can regard that as a threat that he would not get workmen. "They then left." Then he speaks of a letter which was received, which was read, a letter of the 17th November, not, I think, very material, and the following week some work-people applied, and now he begins. "On the 24th December, I saw Matthews near the place in Ogle-street; it was between nine and eleven; Matthews and another were walking up and down opposite; I saw them when I went in, and when I came out; I saw Matthews there for five weeks." Of course it is material to consider whether this was done with a view to coerce or not. "Sometimes Ham, and sometimes Reed were with him; they were walking up and down, and if anyone came towards the factory, they have often spoken to them."

Now it has been said that being there, seeing persons going in and merely speaking to them, and recommending them not to go in, would not be an offence, and would not, of itself, as a matter of course and necessarily, indicate that what was done was done with a view to coerce. "I have seen them there whenever I went, for five weeks; Matthews was there regularly, and I have seen Ham and Reed there, certainly during the last week in January, and up to the 11th of February."

Therefore,

Therefore, you see, Mr. Graham speaks, to a certain extent, as to there being no distinction between the men. He introduces the case by speaking to having seen them all. I don't think there is anything very material in his cross-examination. He repeats again that he saw Matthews for five weeks in Ogle-street, and Reed with him.

Then you have the witness Stride; the man who was unwell, and who went back to work. He says: "Ever since the latter end of May he was in the employ of Messrs. Jackson and Graham. In November," he says, "I was a member of the Alliance Company. I remember the notice. There was a meeting held at the corner of Foley-street, a meeting of workmen belonging to the society. Mr. Ham was the chairman. Weiler and Reed were there. There was a discussion, and a resolution that none should go, or agree to go back, till we had orders from the executive committee." Now they had a perfect right to go, or not to go. "There was a resolution that a deputation should go and see if we could go on again on the old terms; we were to sign a book twice a day. Something was said about advertisement; they would write to the secretaries in the country, and block all towns from sending men." That may, perhaps, be explained either way. It is for you to say whether it indicates that what was done, was done with a view to coerce Messrs. Jackson and Graham in the mode of carrying on their business. He says: "I wanted to go back and try the new system. There was another meeting on the 16th." This matter was on the 14th (Saturday), when they met to consider what they should do. "Ham took the chair. We discussed; several wanted to go back, but they would not go if the executive committee wished them not. Reed was there; and I am certain Weiler was there. Picketing was mentioned; one of them said, 'Had we not better put some pickets on?' and proposed to be one; but the chairman said 'No; don't be in too great a hurry; it may come on by and bye.'"

Gentlemen, you have heard what I have said about picketing; that it may be done for a harmless purpose. "On Tuesday, 17th, I resigned my membership of the society, and went back; I have been working there ever since." Then, he says, five or six days afterwards, he saw the men, what he calls, picketing; walking up and down. He says: "I could see them from the front of my bench, where I was working; I saw them from after breakfast till seven in the evening; that continued up to the second Tuesday in February. It continued all day, sometimes two, sometimes three, sometimes four men were so engaged. I have seen all the defendants doing this; Matthews most; he was there all day. Weiler was often there; and one week Ham was there almost every day. I knew him to be a member of the executive. I saw Hibbert frequently towards the last, walking up and down." Therefore, there is evidence that they have been seen, not all five together, but each with the other, so as to bring them very much together in the matter.

Then he says: "On one occasion Matthews followed me to the 'Wheatsheaf'; he began talking about the work, who some new men were. He asked me to have something to drink, to which I had no objection. Then he turned his conversation to the new hands. He said, 'You have been acting very foolish to stay in there and work, when, if you come out, we can get you a shop as good, or better.' He then said to me, if I could influence the other men to come out, why not come back again the next day and get reinstated?" He wanted him, you see, to influence the other men to come out, and himself to come back to get reinstated in the society. "I said I was satisfied and comfortable, and I wished to remain where I was. He said he was surprised at me, after being secretary to a society, and he wished me to come out and they would support me, and anything in reason they would furnish me with. On leaving, he said, 'I hope you will come.' I did not go back. I saw him afterwards; he followed me, and said, 'Of course, you will be called *black*, go where you will, and you will find you will not be able to get work in London or elsewhere. On one occasion Reed beckoned me, and said, 'How are things looking with the new hands?'" and then he says, "I went away." He says: "Matthews and Reed were not at work, because they were picketing regularly; they could not be at work." He says: "I went back not to lump work, but to finish by the hour work, which I had begun. I found, when I went back, one man and two boys in the same shop as myself. At the latter end of January, I began lump work; my boy was with me." Then something was asked about the sweating system, which is not material. He says: "The last I saw of Matthews was in December."

Then Williams Parry is called, who is the foreman. He speaks to the notice on the 15th, and says that one man and two boys remained. "On Tuesday the old ones came to take their tools away." He did not remember anybody coming during the first week, but Stride came back on the Wednesday. He was paid by the hour some weeks. The week following the 23rd of November we had applications. On the Monday I saw certain persons walking up and down from eight in the morning till five in the evening; generally two men, and sometimes three."

Now one question would be, was this done for the purpose of preventing the prosecutors from getting workmen, so as to disable them from carrying on their business; was it done with a view of coercion, or was it done merely in their own interests, with a view of persuading these persons to join their society? He says, "I think one man called the first week, and arranged to come on the following Monday. He came, and he afterwards had his tools taken away, and did not return." So there is one instance spoken to in which a man agreed to go to work and has been prevented. "About half a dozen came to apply on the 23rd. They brought in their tools. Three of them afterwards fetched them away. No fresh hands really worked during that week. The following week young Gilliard came to piecework at lump prices." Then he speaks to having

seen men walking up and down in that way, and addressing persons, two or three. "By picketing," he says, "I mean watching the premises and stopping the men." I think he speaks to all the defendants at different times. "Twenty, or I believe 30, men came for employment who did not come afterwards to work, and 20 or 30 came and did work. There was no difficulty in getting men after this step was taken in February to put a stop to it."

Mr. *Hopwood*.—If this was a civil case I should ask your lordship to define "coerce."

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—I have done my best; I would not confuse the jury.

Mr. *Hopwood*.—Still I think for the purposes of this Act it would be so important.

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—I had in my mind all that Mr. Justice Lush said, and Mr. Baron Bramwell also. I could not reserve the case. I would if I could. I cannot define coercion.

Mr. *Hopwood*.—Your lordship has put it, if the effect was to prevent Jackson and Graham from getting men—

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—It is more than that; they must make out that it was done with a view to coerce. I cannot help the Act of Parliament being made out in that way.

Mr. *Hopwood*.—It was suggested that the Judge would put a meaning on the word "coerce."

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—I cannot do that.

Mr. *Hopwood*.—I daresay not, but that was the intention.

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—I cannot say more than this, that it is to operate on the mind by threat or fear.

Mr. *Hopwood*.—That is quite what I should desire, but your lordship said it was to operate on their will by the threat that they could not get workmen.

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—You are quite mistaken. I was very distinct indeed in saying that it was by threats, or by some conduct calculated to, and intended to, deprive them of the exercise of their will.

Mr. *Hopwood*.—The Recorder expressly said that they would be entitled to prevent men coming in answer to the advertisement if they did it peaceably.

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—Well, I have done my best. Then Henry Brown is called. He went at the latter end of December; he was one of the new hands. He says, "I saw Matthews outside; he spoke to me before I went in; he asked me if I did not think I was doing wrong; that was in the public-house. I was asked to go to the public-house by another man who I don't know; he spoke to Matthews; he persuaded me not to go in." That is, not to go in to work. The mere act of persuasion would not of itself be a molestation, either of the workman, nor would it be a molestation of the employer with a view to coercion. "He said that I was doing wrong to go in. He said: 'Have you taken out a job at a price?' I said I had got a price that was satisfactory. He said he did not think the price would last." Then he speaks to having seen men outside, and he says: "I did not go out sometimes, because I did not wish to be bothered; it made it unpleasant." That only shows the extent to which these men were at work, and the persistent way in which they addressed the same man again and again. I don't know whether there is any inference to be drawn from that.

Then the man Hines was the next witness. He said: "Matthews said I should be thought a black sheep by the society if I went in; if I went to all the principal towns I should not be able to get work; he spoke to me several times, offering me money to come out. I saw persons walking up and down for days and days, until they were prevented, three or four of them, from eight in the morning till seven in the evening. I saw Matthews, Hibbert, and Weiler. Matthews said that Stride was a black sheep among the flock; I know Cavers;" and then there came this expression which I have adverted to. I would not place much reliance upon it; it only shows the way in which Matthews was speaking, and the sort of feeling that he had about the man Stride: "Matthews said he should like to have Stride there and see him hung; I did not like being spoken to every time I went out."

Then he is cross-examined, and he says he went to the court, that is before the magistrate, and heard what was said. I would only invite your recollection to his cross-examination and to his manner, and how far it was satisfactory with reference to his having used this word "black sheep," upon which it is supposed some reliance might be placed, because he had heard somebody else use that expression. I daresay, Gentlemen, you remember that his manner was not very satisfactory upon that. He has not said, you see, that he was called a black sheep, but that Matthews had said that Stride was a black sheep.

Now you come to a witness of some importance, a man of the name of Gilliard; he went on the 19th of November. He says: "I saw some men outside, between the 19th and the 23rd; they were watching the men coming out; I afterwards saw Matthews, from five to half-past five, I had to pass him; he spoke to me; he asked me to come out," that

means

means, to leave: "I said I would not." Then he makes use of this expression: "He said it would be all the worse for me if I did not; that they should gain the day, and the society men would go back." That expression is made use of once afterwards; at all events something of the same sort, perhaps twice afterwards; and, of course, you will consider what the meaning of this is, talking of gaining the day; what does that mean? It means that they will gain the day against the employers; that they were striving against them, in order to compel them to go back to day work; that they should gain the day, and then the society men would go back, and he would not. "He said he would give me the same as I was getting to come out; he could find me another shop, and pay my expenses back home again." This is a man who was there, and the object seems to have been to pay him in order to induce him to go away at night. "Hines," he says, "was with me. Another man came and spoke to me. I have seen at other times persons walking up and down; that continued nearly every week." He does not speak very distinctly as to the men. He says, "Matthews came up to me; I believe he followed me on another occasion two or three nights after the first time. He asked me if I was a cabinet-maker? I said yes. He asked me if I was working at this place, and if Stride was working there? I said yes. He asked me if I knew he was a society man? I said yes, he told me so. He said he had left the society on account of this, that he was a black sheep; and he made use of some expression to the effect that 'he would like to see him hung.' He said, I had better come out, as they would win, and the society men would go back, and we should stand no chance." This is what Gilliard represents Matthews to have said to him. "Then he said he would see us another night, and we were to meet him at a certain place, and that he would give me as much money as I got. I said I would not listen to any of this. Next night I was spoken to by three men when I left the factory. I always saw men watching the premises. I felt uneasy about it." That, Gentlemen, is the evidence of this man, upon which you are to say whether what was done was done by these persons, by Matthews, acting in concert with the others, upon a system that they had agreed upon to watch these premises, to address the men in this way with a view to coerce either the employers or the persons whom they so addressed. The language applying to the coercion of the employers was, that "they should win the day," as if the men were striving against them; and the language that is applicable to the coercion of the man himself is that he would have no chance, that they would win the day, and they would go back, and he would not.

There is another witness of the name of Clark; he was the last witness who was examined yesterday. He spoke to seeing a number of them. He speaks to Matthews, I think, like the rest. He says, "Matthews asked if I was working there? I said, yes. He asked, whether it was day-work or piece-work. I told him day-work. He said it was a pity it could not be altered. After that I did not speak. I saw Matthews walking up and down with the other defendants; sometimes they were separate; sometimes together."

That finishes the evidence of yesterday. Then we have a number of witnesses called to-day. The first witness was Herbert Woodrow. He also speaks to them all. He says "I attended several meetings." He got strike pay, at this house that has been mentioned, "The King and Queen," about five hundred yards from the factory. "I went every Tuesday night there." About 40 men had left the factory: they were there, and Reed and Weiler were there. Every morning I had to sign the book." He would have to go there to sign the book in the morning, and that would take him by the end of Ogle-street. He says, "I got a job a few days after the strike. That lasted about 14 days. During the week I always noticed persons near the factory, walking backwards and forwards, on all days. All the defendants I have seen doing that. Afterwards I returned to the firm for a job. I accepted employment. Weiler spoke to me, and another person came with him. They asked me not to resume until the strike was finished. I consented to stay away one week, and I did stay away, and I received 1 l. for that week. They said they would try to bring the strike to an end. Weiler said that they had had a meeting, and they wished me to stay away longer. I resumed work on the 11th January" and then, he says, "I saw them all there, except two." He saw Hibbert, Weiler, and Matthews there.

Then Matthew Brown is called. He is a cabinet-maker, and previous to November was at Lucraft's, at piece-work. "I went to Jackson and Graham's on the 1st December, in consequence of an advertisement. I saw men outside. I saw Matthews marching up and down. I went in and saw the foreman, and agreed to go on at piece-work. On coming out I saw Matthews. He asked me to have something to drink, and we went into the 'York Minster.' He said the men had turned out, and asked me not to go in, and he would give me 35 s. a week while I was out of work. I said I would not go in." I do not say that this is conclusive by any means, but it is for you to consider it. It is not merely reasoning and persuasion; it is giving him this inducement of 35 s. a week while he was out of work. "He said he would give me 5 s. for my expenses, if I did not go in, and he gave me 5 s. Afterwards, as I did not go out, I returned him the 5 s. From this time till the men were taken in custody I saw them walking up and down. There was always somebody walking up and down." Now, if the premises were so beset by persons standing round that men could not get in without passing through them, a different question might arise, but it is not put in that way. They are not there to prevent people

from going, by force. They are only there doing that to which your attention has been called.

Another cabinet-maker, Baker, has been called. He worked at Dyer's before. He says, "I went to work on the Friday, and I have continued there. The week following I went in I saw all the men. I saw Matthews. He asked me if I knew I was injuring the men out, and myself. He asked me where I had worked. I said at Dyer's, and I had left to better myself. He asked me if anything would induce me. I said, no. There were others present. He said I should be blacked. I spoke to Matthews afterwards, about a week after."

James Tame was also one of the new hands. He went in just before Christmas, and has continued there since. He says, "I saw Matthews walking up and down. I saw all the defendants there. Matthews spoke to me on the Monday. He asked me if I intended to stop in. I said, yes, and I told him that I had told his friend before that it was no use asking me."

Then William Smart is called; he really says nothing. Edward Marchant says, "I went to Jackson and Graham's a fortnight before the arrest took place. When I went for work I noticed two or three men in the street walking about. They spoke to me. Weiler was one. They were there both dinner time and in the evening. Weiler told me not to go in. He told me I should not get work anywhere else if I went in. He asked me to join the society, and offered me money, 27 s. a week."

Carr was the French polisher. He only speaks to the fact of the defendants being there. Nothing seems to have been said to him.

Then Benjamin Jewell, who was the cabinet-maker who did not leave. He had only been there ten days before the strike, and he has continued there from that time. He says, "I saw men outside from time to time, and saw them speak to men. They did not speak to me."

Now, Gentlemen, the question for you to consider is this: you have already heard the extent to which it appears, between that period of November and January, some of the witnesses say this goes. There was always somebody there, and it is for you to say whether they were there for the purpose of watching and seeing the persons come in and go out and speaking to them, that is to say, were they watching, seeing what was going on there, and seeing who were coming in and going out? That is the first thing. Was there a watching? The next thing is, were they watching merely for the purpose of speaking to the persons and seeing who they were, or anything of that sort? And is it made out to your satisfaction, which the prosecution are bound to do, that looking at all the circumstances to which I have called your attention, and which I will not go through again, that this was calculated to, and intended to, operate on the mind and will, either of Jackson and Graham as to the mode of carrying on their business, or upon the mind and will of the workmen so as to induce them to leave the employ which they were asked to do, and so to coerce them; to coerce Jackson and Graham in their mode of carrying on their business, and to coerce the workmen to leave the employment? Those are the two counts of the indictment, and you will be able to deal with them separately, and say whether you are satisfied, as regards the one or the other, that the defendants did the act which is complained of, and which I have particularly called your attention to, namely, watch and beset the house, that is to say, molest one or the other by watching and besetting the house with a view to coerce. I think you can dispose of the case now.

Mr. *Harris*.—Will your Lordship allow me to ask if you will kindly leave to the jury this question, whether the evidence for the prosecution shows that it was done with a view to coerce or with a view to induce?

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—No, I shall leave it to the jury that the prosecution must satisfy them that it was done with a view to coerce.

Mr. *Harris*.—Yes, not merely to induce.

Mr. *Besley*.—To coerce the master or the men.

Mr. *Harris*.—Will your Lordship kindly tell the jury, that if they have any doubt—

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—I have done so, and more than once. The burden of proof is upon the prosecution. I don't wish to terrify you by that; they must make it out to your satisfaction.

The jury retired to consider their verdict at 4.30, and returned into court at 5 o'clock, finding all the defendants GUILTY.

SENTENCE.

Mr. Baron *Cleasby*.—Prisoners at the bar, you have been convicted, after a full trial and most able defence, of this offence, upon evidence which I must say is quite satisfactory to my mind; and I can't help thinking that the conduct pursued by you which has resulted in this conviction, was most harsh and injurious. It was not for a few days only, but it was persisted in for a long time. I don't know what would become of society if any number of persons could be allowed to watch and beset the premises of people in business. I can imagine nothing more annoying, or more calculated to prevent him from exercising his

his free will, and certainly nothing could be more injurious to a man's business than to have, day by day, morning and night, his premises watched, and persons going there and going away accosted and addressed, with money offered to them, and to some extent threats held out, in the way that those persons were. At the same time, I cannot help feeling that you did what you did believing that, under the law as it exists, you were only doing what you had a right to do. There are difficulties connected with the law, and you may have acted under that supposition possibly; but I can't regard that as a reason why there should be no punishment, nor can I accept at all the statement that was made by the learned counsel in opening the case, that this prosecution is not brought for the purpose of punishment. Everything combines to make me feel justified in imposing upon you a very slight punishment, and that punishment is, that you and each of you be imprisoned for the term of one calendar month.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT
(REGINA v. HIBBERT).

COPY of SHORTHAND NOTES of the EVIDENCE
and SUMMING UP of Baron *Cleasby* in the Case
of *Regina v. Hibbert* and others, tried at the
Old Bailey on the 5th and 6th days of May
1875.

(*Mr. William Edward Forster.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
2 June 1875.*

223

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT (CHARGE OF THE RECORDER).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 22 June 1875 ;—for,

“COPY of the CHARGE of the RECORDER to the GRAND JURY with reference to the Case of the FIVE MEN tried at the CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT for CONSPIRING to coerce others in their Trade.”

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.

Monday, 5th April 1875.

The QUEEN against WALTER HIBBERT and others, for Conspiracy.

THE RECORDER'S CHARGE TO THE GRAND JURY.

GENTLEMEN, there is one other charge to which I wish to call your attention somewhat carefully. It is a charge against Walter Hibbert and others, who are indicted for a conspiracy to molest and obstruct William Edgar Graham and others, with a view to injure them in their business as cabinet-makers. The evidence, as far as I can collect from the depositions, will be mainly this: It appears that on the 13th of November last, the prisoners were in the employ of the prosecutors, Messrs. Jackson & Graham, in Oxford-street, and on Friday, the 13th of November, notice was given by the foreman of the prosecutors that they intended henceforth only to employ men who were willing to be paid according to piece-work, and they were told that those who were willing to do that should give in their names to the foreman, and the others were to consider themselves discharged, and would not be re-employed in the following week. Very few, if any, apparently gave in their names, and, on the following Monday, hardly any came to work, I believe only one or two men, and a boy; the others all absented themselves, as they had a perfect right to do. In the course of that day Mr. Graham was waited upon by two of the prisoners, Ham and Reed, and another person, to know what he was intending to do. He said that he had made up his mind only to employ those who were willing to be paid in that way. One of the persons present at that time, said, “Has it entered into your head that you probably will not be able to obtain anybody to work on those terms?” Mr. Graham said, no doubt he should find persons as long as good work and good pay was given them. However, they told him that possibly he might not. From that time the prisoners and the greater part of the men refused to work. Of course that they had a perfect right to do if they thought fit.

It appears that on the 14th of November, that is, the day after the notice had been given, there was a meeting of the Alliance Cabinet-makers, which I suppose is a society to which several of the defendants belong, at which the matter was discussed, and it was agreed among them that none of them would go to work on those terms, and that they would do what they could to persuade others to take the same course. Then a question was raised whether they should establish a system of what is called “picketing.” However, it was determined that they should wait. “Let us do nothing hastily,” it was said, “it may possibly come to that by and by.” Shortly after that the system was adopted of several of the defendants, and others, walking, or what they call parading, up and down the street in front of the place of business of Messrs. Jackson & Graham. And it appears that there are one or two cases in which it is shown that they spoke, either to somebody who was working there, or others who professed to be going to work, and advised them not to go. That seems to have been done quite quietly and peaceably. They said, “You had better not go; this plan will soon be over, and you will be looked upon as a black sheep; and you will not be supported in the same way afterwards.” That, it appears, was said to one person who continued to work there. It appears also, that there was another person, who was a sort of detective, who went and pre-

tended that he was going, evidently to see what was done by the defendants. They spoke to him in the same way. He said that he wanted work, and they advised him not to go there; they said: "If you come with us you will be placed upon the same terms as the others; you will have your strike pay; the contest will not last long; you had better not go to work." That seems to have been said to one or two persons.

Besides this, they continued, generally three or four, parading up and down the street during the ordinary working hours; but no disturbance of any sort seems to have been created at any part of the time.

It appears that advertisements were put in the papers, on the one side inviting men to come and work, on the other side warning them against working, and saying that there was a strike on the premises.

Now, as far as I can judge from the depositions, that is the general nature of the evidence that will be laid before you. And the charge against the defendants, which will probably be stated with more particularity in the indictment to be laid before you, is, that they have conspired to molest and obstruct Messrs. Graham, with a view to injure them in their business.

Now, in order to constitute a criminal conspiracy, there must be a combination, either to effect an unlawful object, or to effect an object, whether it be lawful or unlawful, by unlawful means.

With respect to the original dispute, both parties, employers and employed, were acting within their rights. The employers had a perfect right to say that in future they would not employ men who were not willing to be paid by piece-work, and the men had a perfect right to say that they would not work on those terms. Not only had each man that right, but the men, as a body, had a right to agree together that they would not work on those terms, and they were at liberty to persuade others to come to the same determination. And this they might do in the expectation that the employers, in consequence of their inability to obtain workmen upon his terms, would be willing to waive those terms.

The original object, therefore, being lawful, the question is whether the defendants have conspired to use unlawful means to obtain their object.

In considering this question it is necessary to call your attention to the Criminal Law Amendment Act, as it seems to me that it is under this, if at all, the indictment in this particular case can be supported. By that Act it is provided that no person shall be liable to any punishment for doing, or conspiring to do, an act on the ground that such act would restrain, or tend to restrain, the free course of trade, unless the act is one of the acts there specified, and is done with a view of coercing, as is therein described.

Now whatever may have been the intention of the framers of this clause, there is, I think, no doubt, worded as it is, that it has a limited application, and that an indictment for conspiracy at common law may be sustained, although the parties accused may not have been guilty of any of the acts specified in the Criminal Law Amendment Act. Whether that is the case in this particular instance or not, there would be no evidence to support an indictment at common law, unless the case is brought within the provision I have pointed out, and it is shown that there is a conspiracy to do an act which is forbidden by the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

Among the acts forbidden by that Act is this, the molesting or obstructing any person, by watching or besetting any place, or the approach to such place, where his business is carried on, with a view to coerce such person to alter his mode of carrying on his business.

This then is the question that you will have to consider, whether the evidence that is laid before you is sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case that the defendants did conspire to molest or obstruct the prosecutors, by watching or besetting their place of business, and whether they did this in order to coerce them to alter their mode of carrying on their business.

And here you must observe that the question is, not whether they have endeavoured to take their stand by themselves refusing to work, and by persuading others not to work; this they have a right to do; but the question is whether they have tried to effect that object in a way that is forbidden by the Act, and with that purpose. That they did watch the place of business, probably, there is no doubt, but there are some purposes for which they had a perfect right to watch. When a contest of this sort is going on, it is not unusual, I believe, to watch, in order to see that none of the men who receive what is called "strike pay," are also receiving wages from the employer. But the more important object, no doubt, that the watchers had in view was, to inform all comers when, for instance, any might have been attracted to come there by the advertisements which had been inserted in the newspapers to inform them of the existence of the strike, and endeavour to persuade them to join them. All this is lawful so long as it is done peaceably, without anything being done to interfere with the perfect exercise of free-will on the part of those who were otherwise willing to work on the terms proposed by the employer.

The distinction to which I wish to draw your attention is well pointed out, as it appears to me, by Mr. Justice Lush, in a case in which a similar question arose, in which he says: "To bring them within the terms of the Act under which the indictment is framed, there must have been threats or molestation, otherwise than by endeavouring peaceably and in a reasonable manner to persuade others to abstain from work." He refers to a previous case, that had been tried at Leeds, where there had been hooting at the men who were proposing to work, calling them names; in which case he had held that the parties pursuing that line were guilty of the offence of molestation and intimidation, in preventing, by terror, the

free

free exercise of the men's will; and he says at the end, "The question that we have to decide is, whether the defendants did endeavour to control the free agency, or to overcome the free will of their fellow-workmen, by force or intimidation. If there had been merely persuasion in the matter, whatever the consequences were, it would not be at all an unlawful act."

It seems to me, gentlemen, that, guided as one may fairly be by that decision of the learned judge, and by that exposition of the law, in which I perfectly agree, I should suggest to you that the sort of question you will have to ask yourselves is, whether the evidence shows that the defendants were guilty of obstructing and rendering difficult of access the prosecutor's place of business, or whether anything which they did was calculated to deter or intimidate those who were passing to and fro, or whether there was an exhibition of force, calculated to produce fear in the minds of ordinary men, or whether the defendants, or any of them, combined for that purpose, whether they combined in order to do it.

If you think that, it seems to me, then it will be your duty to find a true bill; but if you think their conduct may be accounted for by a desire to ascertain who were the persons working there, or peaceably to persuade them or any others who were proposing to work there, to join their fellow workmen, who were contending, whether rightly or wrongly, to act for the interests of the general body, it seems to me that there is no evidence sufficient to establish the charge that is here made. That is the main question you will have to consider. Did they conspire together, first by the exhibition of force to obstruct the passage of persons to the place of business, and by that exhibition of force to deter them from taking a line contrary to that of the persons exhibiting that force, or whether they conspired by terror and intimidation to deprive the men of their free will to bestow their labour just where they thought fit. If they did that, it seems to me that they have laid themselves open to a criminal charge. But if, on the contrary, they were only there peaceably to warn persons that there was a strike, and peaceably to tell them that it would be to their interest to join their strike, and not to adopt a system which, whether rightly or wrongly, was what they considered otherwise than advantageous to their interests, if they merely did that, I cannot see any ground upon which this criminal charge exists.

I think, gentlemen, if you put these questions to yourselves, when you have decided upon them, you will be guided to a right decision whether to find or ignore the Bill that will be laid before you.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT
(CHARGE OF THE RECORDER).

COPY of the CHARGE of the RECORDER to the GRAND
JURY with reference to the Case of the FIVE MEN
tried at the CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT for CON-
SPIRING to coerce others in their Trade.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
23 June 1875.*

SARAH CHANDLER.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 11 August 1875 ;—for,

“COPY of CORRESPONDENCE in the case of *Sarah Chandler*, between the
Home Office and the Justices.”

LETTER from Mr. *A. Maples* to the Secretary of State for the Home
Department.

(46,045—1.)

Sir,

Spalding 10 July 1875.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt this afternoon of your telegram, requesting information in the case of Sarah Ann Chandler, a child who was before the magistrates in Petty Sessions here on Tuesday last.

In reply, then, I have the honour to report that the child in question appeared before the magistrates in Petty Sessions on the 6th inst., in obedience to a summons granted upon an information on oath charging for that she, on Sunday, the 4th July inst., did wilfully damage a geranium plant, then growing and being in the Almshouses garden, in Church street, Spalding, and belonging to one John Cotton, by then and there plucking and breaking a flower therefrom, and thereby doing damage to the amount of one shilling.

The girl was attended at the hearing by her mother, and on my reading over (as usual) the charge to her, and asking whether she admitted or denied the same, the girl replied that she had taken the flower, but was very sorry for it, and would not do so any more, or words to that effect.

Thereupon a sort of conference ensued between the magistrates and the mother as to the girl's general conduct and character, and it being known to the chairman that she was a very troublesome, unruly, and untruthful child in the National School here, and the mother admitting that her daughter was very unmanageable, and gave her parents at home a great deal of trouble, it was at length (but only after great consideration) determined, as the best possible thing that could be done for the child, and as the most likely means to reclaim her from her evil propensities, and the greatest benefit to the parents and four younger children at home, to pass the sentence upon her which seems to have reached your ears, viz., 14 days' imprisonment in the House of Correction, to give time for the necessary inquiries, and four years subsequent confinement in a reformatory. The mother naturally was very unwilling to part with her child, and begged for a lighter sentence, though at the same time she admitted that she was a bad girl, and the being sent away to a good school might be beneficial to her.

After the Petty Sessions I wrote off to the managers of two reformatories, Coventry and Doncaster, to ascertain whether they had room for the child; the authorities at Coventry replied that their establishment was full; but from Doncaster the reply was that they could receive her, and accordingly the proper form for her admission into that institution was at once filled up and forwarded to Doncaster for consideration by their committee at their weekly meeting this day.

I beg to enclose you a copy of such form as filled up, and to call your particular attention to those passages in the same, which I have marked with an asterisk in the margin. It further appears that the child has been very troublesome to the surgeon and matron in the gaol during the little time that she has as yet been there.

I have made inquiries at the Almshouses since the receipt of your telegram, and I was there informed that the girl has no relative whatever living there, and that she went considerably out of her way from the street to pluck the flower in question.

question. She had also been previously detected, and repeatedly warned not to meddle with them; and, in addition, I have to observe that out of 125 attendances the child ought to have given during the last quarter at the National School, she has only been four times; and out of 428 times she should have attended school last year, she was there only 110 times.

I have now, I believe, communicated all the important particulars in this case, and have the honour to subscribe myself,

Sir, &c.

(signed) *A. Maples*, Clerk to the Justices.

The Right Hon.
Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the
Home Department.

APPLICATION for Admission of *Sarah Ann Chandler* to the West Riding Reformatory School for Girls at Doncaster.

Certified pursuant to Act of Parliament.

THE committee request that the following questions relating to the girl and her parents may be answered as fully and accurately as possible, as the particulars have to be communicated to the Home Office, and that all other obtainable information, both of the parents and child, be given.

The limited amount of funds at the disposal of the committee compels them to request as much pecuniary assistance from the magistrates recommending the case as they can give from the resources at their command. In ordinary cases, the committee would ask for a contribution of one shilling and sixpence per week towards the expenses.

No penitentiary case will be admitted. The medical certificate must show that the girl is healthy and able to work. The warrant of committal (29 & 30 Vict. c. 117, s. 15) must be sent with the girl.

QUESTIONS.	ANSWERS.
Name of the girl - - - - -	Sarah Ann Chandler. Age, 12 years 6 months.
Description - - - - -	Hair, sandy. Eyes, brown. Height 4 ft. 5½ in. Marks, scar from burn on right side. General complexion, fresh. Weight, 4 stone 13 lbs.
Late residence - - - - -	Commercial-road, Spalding, Lincolnshire.
Legitimate or illegitimate - - - - -	Legitimate.
Parish to which she belongs - - - - -	Spalding, Lincolnshire.
Work to which she has been accustomed and mode of life generally.	Assisting mother in household and in field work.
Offence for which she is now under sentence -	Wilful damage to a geranium plant in almshouses garden by plucking a flower therefrom, at Spalding, on Sunday, 4th July 1875, 14 days imprisonment and four years subsequent detention in a reformatory.
Sentence of imprisonment and of detention in reformatory.	Summarily in petty sessions at Spalding, on 6th July 1875, by the Rev. Edward Moore and Ancell Ball, Esq., justices of the peace for parts of Holland, Lincolnshire.
By whom passed, where, and whether summarily sessions or assizes.	6th July 1875, to House of Correction at Spalding.
Date of committal to prison and where imprisoned.	Nil.
Previous committals. For what offences. For what periods.	Reads, imperfectly; writes, imperfectly; ciphers, very imperfectly; general knowledge, meagre.
State of education - - - - -	Yes, at Spalding National and Church Schools, at intervals, and irregularly.
Has she been at day or Sunday school - - -	Mischievous in streets, vindictive to companions and sisters, masterful and troublesome to parents.
* Reputed character - - - - -	Requiring matron's care.
* Behaviour during imprisonment - - - - -	Own parents.
Parents' names (distinguishing whether either is a step-parent).	

QUESTIONS.	ANSWERS.
Father - - - - -	Thomas Chandler.
Mother - - - - -	Sarah Ann Chandler.
Residence (post address) - - - - -	Commercial-road, Spalding.
Occupation (and if constant) - - - - -	Field workers; irregular work.
Character - - - - -	Honest, laborious; father a violinist in public-houses at fair times.
Wages - - - - -	Uncertain; father's probably average 10 s. a week.
Whether one or both are dead - - - - -	Both living, and have one boy 14, and four other girls 11, 7, 5, and 2 years.
Weekly amount (if any) which parents engage to pay, or which they ought to be called upon to pay.	The magistrates will cause father to be summoned and consider this.
* Treatment of girl by parents - - - - -	Wanting in strictness and regularity.
When to be sent for admission to this reformatory.	20th July 1875.
Name and post address of superintendent of police to whom the collection of parents may be intrusted.	John Leaper, Superintendent of County Police, Spalding.
(The amount should be remitted through the superintendent of police of the district quarterly, to the Rev. S. Turner, H. M. Inspector of Reformatories, Parliament-street, London, and if not punctually paid he will enforce it. If the parents make no offer they will be liable to have the amount assessed by magistrates.)	
General remarks - - - - -	Complaints were made against prisoner of repetitions of above offence notwithstanding cautions given her, and the mother informed the magistrates that prisoner was troublesome to govern at home, and had a bad, masterful, and vindictive temper. Her late schoolmistress also much complained to the school managers, of prisoner's troublesome and inconceivably mischievous conduct while attending school.
*	(Signed) Edward Moore, J. P. for the parts of Holland, Lincolnshire, The Parsonage, Spalding.
Signature and address of party making this return.	Date, 9th July 1875.
Register No.	

MEDICAL QUESTIONS.

QUESTIONS.	ANSWERS.
Is the girl generally sound and healthy -	Yes.
Has she the use of all her limbs, her eyesight, and hearing.	Yes.
Is she of sound intellect - - - - -	Yes.
Any tendency to scrofula or consumption -	None.
Subject to epileptic or other fits - - - - -	Not to my knowledge.
Is she free from cutaneous disorder and from venereal diseases.	Yes.
Has she had the cow-pox or small-pox, hooping cough or scarlet fever.	Has been vaccinated. The girl is not certain as to having had scarlet fever or hooping cough.

W. Foster Vise, Medical Officer,
House of Correction, Spalding.

All applications for admission of girls must be addressed to the Secretary, C. E. Palmer, Solicitor, Doncaster.

LETTER from Mr. *A. Maples* to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

(46,045—2.)

Sir,

Spalding, 12 July 1875.

I HAD the honour to report to you by Saturday evening's post, in compliance with your telegram, the particulars of Sarah Ann Chandler's case, on which a motion is to be made in the House of Commons to-morrow evening.

I take the liberty to trouble you with this further communication in consequence of a strong leading article in the "Daily Telegraph" to-day, to which my attention has been called, that you may be furnished with the means of replying to a few inaccuracies appearing in that article, in case Mr. Ritchie should, on his motion, happen to make any use of or point upon them.

1. The child has no aunt or relation whatever living in our Almshouses.
2. The flower plucked was not adjacent to the highway or street.
3. Mr. Harrison and Mr. Taylor, two of the magistrates named in afore-said article, reside several miles away from Spalding, and had left the court to go home before Chandler's case was called on. The other three gentlemen, the Reverends E. Moore and J. T. Dove, and Dr. Ball, were the adjudicating justices.
4. The child bears a thorough bad character, but it is true that she had never previously been convicted, or accused before a magistrate.
5. The Rev. E. Moore and Dr. Ball have no children, but the Rev. J. T. Dove has rather a numerous family.
6. The Almshouses in question form three sides of a square, the fourth side being palisaded off from the street, and the child had to go full 20 yards on to the premises from the street before she could reach the flower in question, which she plucked and ran off with.

Hoping that these further particulars may not be unacceptable,

I have, &c.

(signed) *A. Maples*, Clerk to the Justices.

The Right Hon.

Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department.

LETTER from Sir *H. Selwin-Ibbetson* to the Clerk to the Justices, Spalding.

Sir,

Whitehall, 13 July 1875.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State to acknowledge your letter of the 10th instant, and to acquaint you, for the information of the committing magistrates in the case Sarah Ann Chandler, that after full consideration of all the circumstances, Mr. Cross felt bound to advise the remission of the remainder of the prisoner's sentence.

I am, &c.

The Clerk to the Justices,
Spalding.

(signed) *Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*.

LETTER from Rev. *E. Moore* to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

(46,045—9.)

Sir,

Spalding, 17 July 1875.

I FEEL compelled to appeal to you for advice under the circumstances consequent upon your reply to Mr. Ritchie's question in the House of Commons last Tuesday respecting the magistrates who sentenced the girl Sarah Chandler to a reformatory with the requisite term of detention in a prison.

I beg

I beg to refer you to the enclosed extract from the "Stamford Mercury" of the 16th instant, for some account of one part of the excitement, and I beg you to refer to the superintendent of the county police stationed at Spalding, for further information.

I respectfully assure you I do not shrink from the most searching investigation into my conduct as a magistrate, either generally, or in this case in particular. All the inquiries I have made respecting Sarah Chandler, and her surroundings, tend to confirm my impression that the sentence we pronounced would have been for the child's immediate and ultimate advantage; nevertheless, from the first, I have respectfully acknowledged your decision as to her discharge.

I have, &c.

The Right Hon. R. A. Cross, M.P., (signed) *Edward Moore*.
Secretary of State for the Home Department.

EXTRACT from the "Stamford Mercury," of the 16th July 1875.

The case of sending a Child to Prison for plucking a Flower.

A CORRESPONDENT at Spalding sends to the "Daily News" the following additional particulars of this case: "At the Petty Sessions a little girl, named Sarah Chandler, was brought up on a charge of doing injury to certain geranium plants belonging to John Cotton, an inmate of the almshouses, Spalding, by wilfully plucking a flower therefrom. The child pleaded guilty to the charge. She was described to the Bench as being an exceedingly mischievous girl, and her mother admitted in Court 'she could do nothing with her;' when it was suggested that the girl should be sent to a reformatory she begged of the Bench not to adopt that extreme measure, but in spite of her appeals the little girl was sent to imprisonment for a fortnight, and to a reformatory for four years. The case, as soon as it was known in the town, excited very considerable sympathy, and inquiry began to be made by some of the leading inhabitants as to the real character of the child. It appeared to some that she was slightly deficient in intellect, but notwithstanding this she had gained several prizes at school, and the neighbours, without exception, described her as a girl whose conduct was not at all worse than that of other girls of the same age. From further inquiries it appeared that the wife of the prosecutor went to the vicar of the parish (the Rev. Edward Moore) to inform him of the girl's misconduct, in order that he might deprive her of an approaching children's treat, and not with any intention of having her summoned. She states, however, that the vicar, who is chairman of the local magistrates, ordered her to obtain a summons, much against her own inclination, and that she has had no rest since the sentence was passed. The affair has caused considerable talk in Spalding, especially as within a period of about six months two other equally severe sentences have been passed." On Tuesday, as will be seen by our Parliamentary report, the case was brought before the House of Commons in the shape of a question to the Home Secretary, not by the Members for the division, but by one of the Members for the Tower Hamlets, to whom the constituency had to resort for a remedy for a Lincolnshire grievance. Mr. Cross expressed his regret that the facts were substantially true, and added, amid cheers from both sides of the House, that he had ordered the liberation of the child, and had expressed his strong disapprobation of the sentence. The "Leeds Mercury" says, "We have a right, in the name of the public, to demand that proceedings shall not be stayed at this point. If the story told regarding Sarah Chandler's trial by the Court of Petty Sessions at Spalding be correct in all its details, no person of intelligence can hesitate to say that the magistrates who adjudicated upon her case are unfit to discharge the grave duties entrusted to them. Personally they may be amiable and worthy men; their error in this matter may have been entirely due to a momentary lack of discretion, a failure of the intelligence such as all mortals are, according to the old proverb, liable to; but whatever may have been the cause of the grievous miscarriage of justice upon which we have commented, it is clear that it will never do to run the risk of any repetition of such an incident as this. The Lord Chancellor must look into the case, and must decide whether the dignity of the law, the purity of justice, and the interests of the public, are likely to be maintained by the Spalding Petty Sessions Court as at present constituted." And the "Telegraph" remarks, "As far as can be judged from the grave and earnest manner in which the Home Secretary spoke, the rebuke which he has administered to the Reverend Mr. Moore and his colleagues, is one which they are likely to remember for some time to come. It is to be hoped, however, that the matter will not be allowed to end where it is at present. It is said that under Mr. Moore's chairmanship the sentences which have been passed at Spalding Petty Sessions have been, in several other cases besides that of poor little Sarah Chandler, marked by a cruel and almost vindictive severity; if this be indeed the case, Lord Cairns will no doubt feel it his duty to remove the vicar of Spalding from the Bench. It is possible that Mr. Moore may, if he is well advised, relieve

relieve the Lord Chancellor of any difficulty in the matter by spontaneously placing his resignation in his Lordship's hands." The Spalding Bench, says a local correspondent, is composed chiefly of the clerical element, and has throughout the county an unenviable reputation for severe sentences within the present year, no less than four decisions of the Spalding Bench have been overruled by higher tribunals. The notice in the London papers, and the leading article in Monday's "Daily Telegraph," made the case the topic of the day in Tuesday's market, and the result of Mr. Ritchie's question in Parliament was eagerly awaited. When the statement of the Home Secretary was made known, the excitement of the people was very great. A brass band was called out, and crowds paraded the street until a late hour in the evening, and it only needed the church bells to be rung to complete the general feeling of rejoicing. The band and its followers drew up in front of the residence of the Rev. E. Moore, the chairman of the Bench, who came out to speak to them, and several questions were put by some of the leaders. In the noise and confusion, however, it was impossible for any one to make out correctly what passed, but we understand the reverend gentlemen said, that according to the evidence brought before him, he had given what he considered a just decision. It is but proper to remark, that there is no doubt the magistrates were somewhat misled by the person lodging the complaint, and by the statements of the child's parents, but making due allowance for this, there is the naked fact, that a child of tender years stood before them charged with a most trivial offence, and to send her to a common gaol to blast her character for ever seems to be cruel in the extreme, and opposed to the true spirit of Christianity. On Wednesday morning at about eight o'clock the child was liberated from gaol; a large number of people had some time before congregated outside the gates, and upon her appearance amongst them she was at once placed in a trap decorated with sprays of geranium, &c., and drawn by ready hands in procession through the town. Wednesday being the annual meeting of the Welland Lodge of the Manchester Unity and Nottingham Orders of Odd Fellows, the members headed by military bands marched in procession to the parish church to hear the customary sermon; we noticed almost every member had a sprig of geranium in his button-hole. The sermon was preached by the Rev. E. Moore, and he afterwards dined with them at the Corn Exchange. In an after-dinner speech, he said he took the whole blame to himself in the case of Sarah Chandler, as the other magistrates were guided by his statements, and he believed he was doing the best for the girl. On Wednesday evening the following handbill was issued:—"A public meeting of the inhabitants of this town will be held in the Corn Exchange to-morrow evening (Thursday), at half-past seven o'clock, to consider the case of Sarah Chandler, now liberated from prison, and to pass certain resolutions thereon."

LETTER from the Secretary of State for the Home Department to the
Rev. E. Moore.

(46,045—9.)

Sir,

Whitehall, 23 July 1875.

WITH reference to your letter appealing to me for advice under the circumstances consequent upon my reply to Mr. Ritchie's question, I have to state, that I cannot at all agree in the view which you have taken, that the sentence which you pronounced was for the child's immediate and ultimate advantage; it was not certainly for the public good.

From inquiries made by me in the office, I find that you have long acted as a magistrate, and that no question has been raised at the Home Office as to your decisions; I did not therefore feel it my duty formally to represent the case to the Lord Chancellor, but in private consultation he quite agrees with me that it was an error of judgment, and a very grave error of judgment, though given in good faith and with the best intentions. I have therefore nothing to add further, feeling strongly that the order for the immediate release of the girl, and the letter stating that the Secretary of State felt bound to interfere, were in themselves a severe rebuke, and that no case of the kind will occur again.

The Rev. Edward Moore, M.A.

I have, &c.
(signed) R. Assheton Cross.

SARAH CHANDLER.

COPY of CORRESPONDENCE in the case of *Sarah Chandler*, between the Home Office and the Justices.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
13 August 1875.*

470.

Under 1 oz.

CIRCUITS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 10 May 1875;—for,

“ RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the several CIRCUITS in *England and Wales*, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such CIRCUITS respectively :—

Circuits.	1873.						1874.						1875:	
	Duration of Circuit.			No. of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			No. of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	No. of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Home - -														
Midland - -														
Northern - -														
Norfolk - -														
Oxford - -														
Western - -														
North Wales - -														
South Wales - -														

Home Office, }
8 June 1875. }

(Mr. Bristowe).

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
21 June 1875.

HOME CIRCUIT.

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the HOME CIRCUITS, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such CIRCUITS.

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
41	32	10	—	—	—	32	34	10	6	5	—	41	8

Henry Ivory, Deputy Clerk of Assize.

Note.—The above numbers of days are taken from the days when the Circuits began until the days when they finished, Sundays included.

NORFOLK CIRCUIT.

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the NORFOLK CIRCUIT, and the Number of Days on which an Unpaid Commissioner Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such CIRCUITS.

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioner Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioner Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioner Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
32	32	5	—	1	—	38	31	5	—	1	—	39	1

15 May 1875.

Charles Platt, Clerk of Assize.

MIDLAND CIRCUIT.

RETURN of the Clerk of Assize for the MIDLAND CIRCUIT as to the Duration of CIRCUITS, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes.

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
45	44	21	14	—	—	46	51	18	12	16	2	44	22

NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the NORTHERN CIRCUIT, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such Circuits respectively.

CIRCUITS.	1873.						1874.						1875.	
	Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
Westmoreland, Cumberland, Northumberland, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*	12	11	4	-	-	-	14	13	7	3	2	2	17	2
County Palatine of Lancaster.†	33	35	25	-	-	-	35	34	24	3	2	-	32	-
County Palatine of Durham‡	8	7	14	-	1	-	5	5	6	2	3	-	6	2
TOTAL - - -	53	53	43	-	1	-	54	52	37	8	7	2	55	4

* Extract from letter, dated 19 May 1875:—"No Commissioner has sat to try Causes in the Civil Court at the Assizes specified, the usual practice being for the Criminal Judge, when civil business is very pressing, to obtain the assistance of a Commissioner in the Crown Court, to enable him to assist the Nisi Prius Judge with Causes."
† The above Table gives the number of days on which Unpaid Commissioners sat for Trial of Causes only. They sat far oftener for Trial of Prisoners.
‡ In calculating the "Duration of Circuits," Sundays have been excluded.

OXFORD CIRCUIT.

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the several CIRCUITS holden on the OXFORD CIRCUIT, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such Circuits respectively.

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
45	41	26	-	4	-	42	41	13	8	13	-	46	2

WESTERN CIRCUIT.

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the WESTERN CIRCUIT, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
46	41	10	7	9*	—	45	37	3	5	2	—	41	10

* In consequence of the absence of one of Her Majesty's Judges, Commissioners sat for him six days out of the nine days mentioned above.

W. C. Bovill, Clerk of Assize.

SOUTH WALES CIRCUIT.

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the SOUTH WALES CIRCUITS (inclusive of Commission Days and Sundays), and Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such Circuits.—(The Return includes every Day between the beginning and end of the Circuit).

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
35	32	4	1	—	—	35	32	—	2½	2	—	29	4

Note.—The sitting of Commissioners does not prove either that the Circuit was insufficiently long, or that the number of Judges on Circuit was insufficient. There were some days on Circuit, although not numerous, on which no business was transacted. It is impossible to anticipate the precise amount of time which will be required in each town. Consolidation of counties for Circuit business appears to be the best remedy for this inconvenience.

H. H. Vaughan, Clerk of the Crown, and Associate.

NORTH WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT.

• RETURN as toittings of Unpaid Commissioners.

1873.						1874.						1875.	
Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.			Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.			Duration of Circuit.	Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat.
Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Summer.	Winter.	Spring.	Spring.
Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.	Days.
30	25	3	1	—	—	26	28	5	2	1	—	24	—

Henry Crompton, Clerk of Assize.

CIRCUITS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

RETURN for the Years 1873, 1874, and part of 1875, showing the Duration of the several Circuits in *England* and *Wales*, and the Number of Days on which Unpaid Commissioners Sat for the Trial of Prisoners or Causes during such Circuits respectively.

(*Mr. Bristowe.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
21 June 1875.*

COUNTIES (ENGLAND) (COMMISSION OF THE PEACE).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 7 June 1875;—for,

“ RETURNS of the Number of APPOINTMENTS to the COMMISSION OF THE PEACE in each COUNTY
in *England* since the passing of the Act 34 Vict. c. 18:”

“ And, of PERSONS who, but for that Statute, would have been disqualified.”

RETURN of the Number of APPOINTMENTS to the COMMISSION OF THE PEACE in ENGLISH COUNTIES
since the passing of the Act (34 Vict. c. 18) to amend the Law disqualifying SOLICITORS from being
Justices of the Peace for Counties; and of PERSONS who, but for the passing of that Act, would have been
disqualified.

COUNTY.	Magistrates.	Solicitors.	COUNTY.	Magistrates.	Solicitors.
Bedford - - - - -	16	—	Middlesex and Westminster - - - - -	53	—
Berks - - - - -	18	—	Monmouth - - - - -	28	—
Bucks - - - - -	14	—	Norfolk - - - - -	38	—
Cambridge - - - - -	20	—	Northampton - - - - -	32	—
Cheshire - - - - -	62	—	Northumberland - - - - -	21	—
Cornwall - - - - -	28	—	Nottingham - - - - -	16	—
Cumberland - - - - -	31	—	Oxford - - - - -	24	—
Derby - - - - -	35	1	Rutland - - - - -	7	—
Devon - - - - -	53	—	Salop - - - - -	27	—
Dorset - - - - -	28	1	Somerset - - - - -	42	—
Durham - - - - -	43	1	Stafford - - - - -	64	—
Essex - - - - -	36	—	Suffolk - - - - -	31	—
Gloucester - - - - -	31	—	Surrey - - - - -	45	1
Hampshire - - - - -	37	—	Sussex - - - - -	48	2
Hereford - - - - -	27	—	Warwick - - - - -	40	—
Hertford - - - - -	39	—	Westmorland - - - - -	20	—
Huntingdon - - - - -	16	—	Wilts - - - - -	14	—
Kent - - - - -	65	—	Worcester - - - - -	34	2
Lancashire - - - - -	82	1	Yorkshire:		
Leicester - - - - -	27	—	East Riding - - - - -	8	—
Lincoln (Parts of Lindsay) - - - - -	9	—	North Riding - - - - -	40	—
			West Riding - - - - -	36	—
			TOTAL - - - - -	1,385	9

COUNTIES (ENGLAND)
(COMMISSION OF THE PEACE).

RETURN of the Number of APPOINTMENTS to
the COMMISSION OF THE PEACE in each COUNTY
in *England* since the passing of the Act 34 Vict.
c. 18 ; and, of PERSONS who, but for that Statute,
would have been disqualified.

(*Mr. Goldney.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
7 August 1875.*

COMMON LAW COURTS (NISI PRIUS SITTINGS).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 5 August 1874;—for,

“RETURN for the Years ending the 31st day of July 1872, 1873, and 1874,
of the Number of CAUSES entered for TRIAL in each of the Three
SUPERIOR COURTS of COMMON LAW at the NISI PRIUS SITTINGS in
London and *Middlesex*, the Number of Causes Tried, the Number With-
drawn, Struck Out, or otherwise disposed of, and the Number made
Remanets, by Order or otherwise, at the end of each of the Sittings.”

(*Sir Sydney Waterlow.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
24 February 1875.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

RETURN for the Years ending the 31st day of July 1872, 1873, and 1874, of the Number of Causes entered for TRIAL in the COURT of COMMON PLEAS at the NISI PRIUS SITTINGS in *London* and *Middlesex*; the Number of Causes Tried; the Number Withdrawn, Struck Out, or otherwise disposed of; and the Number made Remanets, by Order or otherwise, at the end of each of the Sittings.

L O N D O N.

SITTINGS.	Total Number for Trial.	New Causes.	Tried.	Withdrawn.	Struck Out.	Stayed by Commission, &c.	Remanets.		
							By Consent.	By Order, &c.	TOTAL.
After Michaelmas Term, 1871 -	133	97	31	37	1	15	5	44	49
After Hilary Term - 1872 -	139	85	34	38	3	15	4	45	49
After Easter Term - " -	59	39	16	4	2	-	5	32	37
After Trinity Term - " -	190	132	31	39	6	18	8	88	96
TOTALS - - -	521	353	112	118	12	48	22	209	231
After Michaelmas Term, 1872 -	204	111	55	57	4	5	31	52	89
After Hilary Term - 1873 -	148	73	52	48	4	11	5	28	33
After Easter Term - " -	42	38	16	8	1	1	2	14	16
After Trinity Term - " -	128	81	52	37	7	9	7	16	23
TOTALS - - -	522	303	175	150	16	26	45	110	155
After Michaelmas Term, 1873 -	126	98	46	46	5	6	13	10	23
After Hilary Term - 1874 -	96	77	45	37	5	2	6	1	7
After Easter Term - " -	34	33	11	11	2	1	1	8	9
After Trinity Term - " -	125	102	55	36	5	9	8	12	20
TOTALS - - -	381	310	157	130	17	18	28	31	59

M I D D L E S E X.

In Michaelmas Term, 1871 -	48	44	25	14	-	-	2	7	9
After Michaelmas Term " -	57	47	24	25	1	-	3	4	7
In Hilary Term, 1872 -	66	54	35	11	1	-	6	13	19
After Hilary Term " -	46	32	26	19	-	-	1	-	1
In Easter Term, 1872 -	79	77	35	17	4	1	1	21	22
After Easter Term " -	20	19	8	3	-	-	-	9	9
In Trinity Term, 1872 -	56	51	24	14	2	-	3	13	16
After Trinity Term " -	86	52	44	32	1	1	3	5	8
TOTALS - - -	458	376	221	135	9	2	19	72	91
In Michaelmas Term, 1872 -	70	69	32	11	3	-	2	22	24
After Michaelmas Term " -	82	50	26	16	3	-	7	30	37
In Hilary Term, 1873 -	90	74	34	26	1	-	14	15	29
After Hilary Term " -	84	40	37	22	3	-	6	16	22
In Easter Term, 1873 -	114	98	57	23	7	-	3	24	27
After Easter Term " -	25	23	10	3	1	-	2	7	9
In Trinity Term, 1873 -	62	59	22	13	1	-	5	21	26
After Trinity Term " -	114	54	31	44	-	3	3	33	36
TOTALS - - -	641	467	249	160	19	3	42	168	210
In Michaelmas Term, 1873 -	54	50	28	10	3	-	3	10	13
After Michaelmas Term " -	100	58	56	31	3	2	5	3	8
In Hilary Term, 1874 -	69	63	32	17	3	1	1	15	16
After Hilary Term " -	60	39	32	15	5	1	4	3	7
In Easter Term, 1874 -	87	85	34	20	2	-	5	26	31
After Easter Term " -	33	30	12	9	-	-	1	11	12
In Trinity Term, 1874 -	56	52	25	15	2	-	1	13	14
After Trinity Term " -	119	68	53	41	5	-	2	18	20
TOTALS - - -	578	450	272	158	23	4	22	99	121

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

RETURN for the Years ending 31st July 1872, 1873, and 1874, of the Number of CAUSES entered for TRIAL in the COURT of EXCHEQUER at the NISI PRIUS SITTINGS in *London* and *Middlesex*; the Number of Causes Tried; the Number Withdrawn, Struck Out, or otherwise disposed of; and the Number made Remanet, by Order or otherwise, at the end of each Sitting.

Year ending	Number Entered.		Number Tried.		Number Withdrawn or Struck Out.			Number of Remanets.	
	London.	Middlesex.	London.	Middlesex.	London.	Middlesex.		London.	Middlesex.
31st July 1872	290	457	115	265	103	190	Michaelmas Term, 1871 Hilary Term - 1872 Easter Term - " " Trinity Term - " "	18 6 17 20	6 2 4 11
31st July 1873	301	564	147	288	142	251	Michaelmas Term, 1872 Hilary Term - 1873 Easter Term - " " Trinity Term - " "	17 4 26 29	8 16 23 33
31st July 1874	337	562	144	330	129	255	Michaelmas Term, 1873 Hilary Term - 1874 Easter Term - " " Trinity Term - " "	15 31 40 87	22 7 21 6

30 August 1874.

Henry Pollock,
Associate, Court of Exchequer.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

RETURN for the Years 1872, 1873, and 1874, of the Number of CAUSES entered for TRIAL in the COURT of QUEEN'S BENCH at the NISI PRIUS SITTINGS in *London* and *Middlesex*; the Number of Causes Tried; the Number Withdrawn and Struck Out; and the Number made Remanets at the end of each Sitting.

TERM AND SITTING.	Number of Causes Entered.		Number of Causes Tried.		Withdrawn and Struck Out.		Remanets.	
	Middlesex.	London.	Middlesex.	London.	Middlesex.	London.	Middlesex.	London.
1872:								
Hilary Term, and Sitzings after - - -	135	64	84	32	53	33	21	41
Easter Term, and Sitzings after - - -	106	39	42	5	33	7	52	62
Trinity Term, and Sitzings after - - -	109	81	55	38	49	47	57	58
Michaelmas Term, and Sitzings after - -	127	114	70	55	69	57	45	60
1873:								
Hilary Term, and Sitzings after - - -	136	100	74	38	59	51	48	71
Easter Term, and Sitzings after - - -	148	47	53	14	44	11	99	93
Trinity Term, and Sitzings after - - -	128	116	63	32	75	61	89	116
Michaelmas Term, and Sitzings after - -	130	100	90	41	86	68	43	107
1874:								
Hilary Term, and Sitzings after - - -	121	107	46	31	68	48	50	135
Easter Term, and Sitzings after - - -	129	39	47	6	39	15	93	153
Trinity Term, and Sitzings after - - -	118	114	53	37	74	71	84	159

Note.—The number of Causes disposed of in each year include the Causes made Remanets from the preceding year.

1 September 1874.

H. G. Campbell,
Associate, Court of Queen's Bench.

COMMON LAW COURTS (NISI PRIUS SITTINGS).

RETURN for the Years ending the 31st day of July 1872, 1873, and 1874, of the Number of Causes entered for TRIAL in each of the Three SUPERIOR COURTS of COMMON LAW at the NISI PRIUS SITTINGS in *London* and *Middlesex*; the Number of Causes Tried, the Number Withdrawn, Struck Out, or otherwise disposed of, and the Number made Remanets, by Order or otherwise, at the end of each of the Sittings.

(*Sir Sydney Waterlow.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
24 February 1875.*

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 16 April 1875;—for,

COPY “of MINUTES and MEMORANDA of the STATUTE LAW COMMITTEE
on the Subject of CONSOLIDATION of the STATUTES, with CORRE-
SPONDENCE consequent thereupon.”

— No. 1. —

MINUTES OF STATUTE LAW COMMITTEE.

8th May 1874.
The Lord Chancellor's Room,
House of Lords.

MEETING of the Committee, summoned by the Lord Chancellor to
confer with him.

Sir J. Lefevre.
Sir T. Erskine May.
Sir H. Thring.

Mr. Reilly.
With Mr. Rickards
and Mr. Wood.

The Lord Chancellor stated that he had asked the Committee to meet him
in order that he might ascertain the state and prospects of the expurgation
of the Statutes of the present reign, and particularly might confer with
them on—

(1.) The expediency and practicability of a systematic consolidation
of groups of those Statutes, so that they might be omitted from the
Edition.

He considered that much might be done by the aid of the Government
Departments concerned, and that Parliament might be expected to take the
Bills to a great extent on trust, as they had taken the Statute Law Revision
Bills. He was also prepared to propose that additional assistance should be
provided, in order that—

(2.) The expurgation by Statute Law Revision Acts might be accelerated;
and

(3.) That the Chronological Table and Index might be revised and
republished after each Session.

After some observations by Members of the Committee, it was arranged that
a Memorandum on the points referred to should be prepared and submitted to
the Lord Chancellor.

— No. 2. —

EXTRACT from MINUTES.

Monday, 18 May 1874.

* * * * *

The Committee agreed to submit to the Lord Chancellor a Scheme for the
partial consolidation of the Statutes, to be prepared by Sir H. Thring and
approved by the Committee.

— No. 3. —

MEMORANDUM for the Lord Chancellor.

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES.

4 June 1874.

THE Statute Law Committee have considered the observations with which the Lord Chancellor favoured them with respect to consolidation of the Statute Law, and, in accordance with his desire, submit their views to him thereon.

The Committee are of opinion that any effective consolidation of the Statute Law should be progressive, and they recommend that it should begin with the easiest and gradually approach the more difficult classes of Statutes requiring consolidation.

The easiest Statutes to consolidate are those in which the subsequent amending enactments can be inserted without alteration, or nearly without alteration, into the framework of the original Statute. The Committee propose that this class should form the first subject of consolidation. The first step to be taken towards consolidating this class of Acts would be to obtain a report from some competent person of the Statutes falling within this class. The next step would be to proceed to a reprint in a consolidated form of the Acts so reported on. The Committee are prepared to undertake the duty of superintending the consolidation of this first class of Statutes on their being furnished with sufficient funds to procure the necessary legal assistance.

The second class of Statutes will be Acts principally departmental, raising no question of law, but requiring to be redrawn either wholly or partially. The Committee would proceed with this class as with the first, beginning with a report, and then superintending the consolidation.

The third class consists of Statutes which would raise no political question, but which require to be reconstructed and amended on a new or partially new basis. The Committee are of opinion that this class of Statutes can scarcely be consolidated except under the superintendence of a Minister charged with the duty of settling their provisions, and of passing them, when settled, through Parliament. The Committee will readily give any assistance in their power in dealing with this class of Statutes, but they could not undertake the entire superintendence of the work of consolidation with a due regard to the occupations in which they are individually engaged.

The fourth and last class of Statutes are those which involve legal and political questions of gravity. Any attempt to deal with such Acts can only be made by gradual instalments, and they may be left out of consideration in connection with a scheme of systematic consolidation.

— No. 4. —

The Lord Chancellor to the Treasury.

Sir,

House of Lords, 1 August 1874.

I AM directed by the Lord Chancellor to acquaint you, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, that his Lordship desires, with a view to the more effectual improvement of the condition of the Statute Law, and as an additional operation to those of expurgation and editing, which have for some time been in progress, that steps be now taken towards systematic consolidation of groups of the Statutes.

The Lord Chancellor has obtained the opinion on this subject of the Statute Law Committee, who are, as their Lordships know, engaged in superintending the operations of expurgation and editing, and I am to enclose copies of the minutes of a meeting of the Lord Chancellor with the Committee, and of the Memorandum of the Committee consequent thereon.

The Lord Chancellor concurs generally with the views of the Committee, as expressed in their Memorandum. He accordingly proposes to obtain such a report as the Committee recommend, respecting the first class of Statutes mentioned

tioned by them, and he would award to the gentleman to be employed for that purpose proper remuneration, according to the time and labour required for the work, not exceeding one hundred pounds.

I am, therefore, to request you to move their Lordships to approve of this expenditure.

I am, &c.

(signed) *Henry J. L. Graham,*

The Secretary of the Treasury.

Principal Secretary.

— No. 5. —

The Treasury to the Lord Chancellor.

My Lord,

Treasury Chambers, 15 August 1874.

I AM desired by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to acquaint your Lordship, in reply to Mr. Henry Graham's letter of the 1st instant, that they are pleased to sanction the expenditure of a sum not exceeding 100 *l.* as remuneration for the gentleman to be appointed to draw up a first report in connection with the proposed consolidation of the Statutes, as described in the Memorandum (enclosed with Mr. Graham's letter) prepared for your Lordship by the Statute Law Committee.

100 *l.*

I am, however, to add that their Lordships' assent is given on the understanding that no liability whatever will be incurred beyond this 100 *l.* without further reference to this Board.

I am, &c.

(signed)

Charles W. Stronge,
pro Secretary.

The Right Hon.
The Lord Chancellor,
&c. &c. &c.

— No. 6. —

EXTRACT from MINUTES.

Wednesday, 24 February 1875.

* * * * *

The Committee considered the Draft Report on Consolidation prepared by Mr. Rickards, and agreed that the form of that Report should be, in some respects, altered, and that the Committee should then submit it, with their own observations thereupon, to the Lord Chancellor.

* * * * *

— No. 7. —

MEMORANDUM for the Lord Chancellor.

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES.

1 March 1875.

THE Statute Law Committee, in pursuance of the Lord Chancellor's directions, on their Memorandum, dated 4th June 1874, requested Mr. Rickards, the editor of the Revised Statutes, to prepare the report upon the statutes described in the Memorandum as of the first class, being such as might be found suitable to be dealt with in the first stage of the work of consolidation. The Committee have received from Mr. Rickards a report, of which a copy is subjoined to this Memorandum.

After considering that report, the Committee are of opinion that a certain number of the subjects of Acts specified therein as belonging to the first class, might advantageously be dealt with in the first instance by Consolidation Bills.

Out of the 20 subjects suggested by Mr. Rickards, the Committee have selected 10, considering that a convenient number to be dealt with in the first instance. None of these appear likely to involve matters of controverted policy; and as it is an essential condition of the proposed consolidations that no change should take place in the substance and effect of existing enactments, but that any change should be in the form and arrangement only, it may fairly be presumed that no material obstacles will be encountered in carrying the Bills into law. The subjects which the Committee suggest for consolidation in the first instance are the following, namely,—

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Alkali Works. | 6. Leases and Sales of Settled Estates. |
| 2. Chain Cables and Anchors. | 7. Naturalization. |
| 3. House of Commons, Issue of Writs in Recess. | 8. Pharmacy, Chemists and Druggists. |
| 4. Houses of Parliament, Summoning of. | 9. Trustee Relief. |
| 5. Houses of Parliament, Powers of Committees, Oaths, Costs, &c. | 10. Trustee Acts, 1850, &c. |

Particulars of the Acts relating to these subjects are given in Schedule 2 to Mr. Rickard's Report.

Another subject, that of Public Schools, can scarcely be considered as belonging to the first class, as described in the Memorandum of 4th June, since the Acts which relate to it, seven in number, would require a more extensive process of re-casting, in order to their being reduced into a single statute. That process can, however, be performed without difficulty, and without involving any change in legal effect. The consolidation of the Acts on this subject (a large part of which was transitory and is spent), would be productive of much convenience to those who are practically engaged in the administration of the public schools, and the Committee are of opinion that it may be safely undertaken in addition to those above enumerated.

The preparation of the Bills now proposed, though requiring considerable care and circumspection, would not, in consequence of the limited scope and dimensions of most of the Acts affected, involve the expenditure of a large amount of time or labour. The Committee recommend that the preparation of the Bills, under their superintendence, should be assigned to Mr. Rickards, who will be able to employ assistants already conversant with the work of Statute Law Revision, but will be himself responsible for the execution of the work. They believe that the Bills can be got ready for introduction before the Session is far advanced, and they suggest that the sum of 200 guineas would be a fair remuneration to be paid to Mr. Rickards for his services, the payments to his assistants and other expenses being included therein.

— No. 8. —

MR. RICKARDS'S REPORT ON CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES.

HAVING been requested by the Committee to report upon the Acts described in their Memorandum of 4th June 1874 as Acts of the First Class; admitting of the easiest and simplest process of consolidation, I have made, with the assistance of Mr. Chaloner W. Chute, a careful survey of the existing Statute Law under its several heads, with the view of selecting the most fitting subjects to be thus dealt with. In so doing I was unavoidably led to examine a large number of Acts besides those properly belonging to the First Class; and to consider the question of consolidation with reference to each of the several classes of Acts described in the Memorandum referred to. Having so done, I request the permission of the Committee to lay before them the result of my observations upon the whole matter, distinguishing those Acts which seem to me best adapted for the first stage of consolidation, but not confining myself to the First Class only.

The main object which I have kept in view is the improvement of the Statute Law by consolidating into single Acts the fragmentary provisions into which many subjects have been distributed by a succession of legislative enactments, and to substitute a coherent and uniform Statute for the patchwork of amend-
ing

ing and sometimes conflicting sections which perplex those who are desirous to ascertain the real intentions of the Legislature.

The number of subjects to which the process of consolidation might advantageously be applied, appears to be very considerable. A list which I have drawn up, but which is probably not exhaustive, contains more than a hundred titles, *see* Schedule No. 1.. This list includes Statutes belonging to each of the four classes described in the Memorandum of the Committee before referred to, but of those subjects a large proportion could not be dealt with without encountering considerable difficulties incidental to the work of consolidation, when the Acts to be dealt with are numerous and complicated, differ much in date and style, and are, as is sometimes the case, of dubious construction.

The consolidation of Statutes described by the Memorandum as of the Second Class, being "Acts principally departmental, raising no question of law, but requiring to be re-drawn either wholly or partially," is likewise a work not exempt from difficulty. There would probably be few such Acts, of any considerable extent or importance, which a department familiar with their operation, and therefore cognizant of their flaws and defects, would not feel the urgent need of amending in some respects. These, however, when presented for re-enactment, might raise questions of policy, and would possibly incur opposition in passing through Parliament.

The course which the Committee have recommended, of beginning with the simplest and easiest class of Statutes, namely, "those in which the subsequent amending enactments can be inserted without alteration, or nearly without alteration, into the framework of the existing Statute," is evidently the most expedient. A tentative mode of proceeding is most likely to obviate alarm and preclude opposition both in and out of Parliament, and it may reasonably be hoped that the Legislature, being assured that no change of substance or effect is being proposed, but that the change proposed is simply in the form and arrangement of existing enactments, would initiate the work of consolidation with a confidence which would gradually be extended to further and more important advances in the same direction.

Objections of another kind may possibly be made to the proposal of consolidating the Acts upon some of the subjects belonging to the First Class, which will now be submitted to the Committee. It may be thought scarcely worth while, in some instances, to re-enact, for the sake of incorporating into one Act, the two or three Acts now in force, which can at present, without much difficulty, be read together, although separate in form. So far as the convenience of the practitioner is concerned, it may be true that the trouble he incurs by referring to two or three volumes of the Statute Book, instead of finding all he wants in one place, is not very serious. But in view of the higher object with which the Committee is concerned, the revision and improvement of the Statute Law, and the substitution of integral for piecemeal legislation, the question assumes a different aspect. It is not convenient, nor is it creditable to our Statute Law, that there should exist on a given subject several Acts of different dates, each successively correcting, interpreting, or partly repealing one or more of its predecessors, leaving the actual state of the law to be gathered by a collation, more or less difficult and troublesome, of the several enactments. In such a case, even although the subject-matter may appear simple and of minor importance, it seems worth while to set the Legislature in motion for the sake of reducing the *disjecta membra* into which the law is now dispersed to a compact whole.

In selecting Acts for consolidation from those which fall within the first class above described, it is recommended that those should be preferred which form isolated and distinct heads of Statute Law. Some heads which at first sight appear capable of being dealt with in their entirety, are found, upon examination, to extend by various ramifications into a large number of Acts of a kindred character, and cannot be interfered with without entering upon a wide field of legislation. For example, the subject of Adulteration runs by a natural connection into those of Sanitary Law, Nuisances, and Licensing.* The subject of Augmentation of Benefices trenches on the wide field of Church Building

**See* ss. 19-22, relating to adulteration of liquors, in the Licensing Act of 1872, 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94.

Building Acts, Queen Anne's Bounty, and the Ecclesiastical Commission. Such heads as Carriers, Attornies, and Solicitors, and others, are mixed up more or less with a variety of kindred subjects, extending over a multiplicity of Acts which it would be inexpedient to meddle with, at least in making, as now proposed, the first essay in a course of consolidation.

After careful examination the following list is submitted to the Committee as one out of which a sufficient number may be found suitable for a first experiment. But few indeed of these admit of purely mechanical consolidation by merely annexing the clauses of one or more amending Acts to those of the principal one. But in all of them the several Statutes under the same head can be welded together without any alterations, except such as are formal only, and the consolidations thus made might be safely proposed to Parliament as involving no change in substance or effect; an assurance which might be verified, if necessary, by showing in the margin of the Bill by diversity of type, or otherwise, the actual alterations verbatim.

SUBJECTS of ACTS of the FIRST CLASS as described in the COMMITTEE'S
MEMORANDUM of 4th June 1874.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Alkali Works. | 11. Naturalization. |
| 2. Bills of Sale. | 12. Parliament, Notice of Meeting of. |
| 3. Charitable Bequests (Ireland). | 13. Parliament, Powers of Committees,
Oaths, and Costs. |
| 4. Chain Cables and Anchors. | 14. Pharmacy, Chemists and Druggists. |
| 5. Colonial Governors' Pensions. | 15. Railways Abandonment. |
| 6. Extradition. | 16. Trustee Relief. |
| 7. Foreign Jurisdiction. | 17. Trustee Acts, 1850, &c. |
| 8. House of Commons, Issue of Writs in
Recess. | 18. Vaccination. |
| 9. Leases and Sales of Settled Estates. | 19. Vaccination (Ireland). |
| 10. Medical Practitioners. | 20. Vice-Admiralty Courts. |

It should be observed that in nearly every case included in the above list the several Acts which would be incorporated are directed to be read or construed together as one Act.

Schedule No. 2 shows in detail the titles of the Acts which would be dealt with under each head, the number of sections in each Act, and other particulars.

The Committee may, perhaps, be of opinion that 10 or 12 out of the above list would be a sufficient number for the first experiment of consolidation in the ensuing Session. If, however, it should be thought advisable to go beyond the first class, and to enter at once upon a consolidation of some of the Acts described in the Memorandum as of the second class, there are some subjects which might be so treated without difficulty, and so as not to involve any alteration of the existing enactments in legal effect. The Acts of the second class do not indeed, like those of the first class, admit of consolidation by simply engrafting the clauses of amending Acts, with only slight alterations of language and arrangement on the original Statute. Those of the second class will require, as the Committee has stated, to be either wholly or partially re-drawn. In most cases the Acts in force will have to be taken to pieces, the repealed or superseded parts to be struck out, the operative enactments to be selected, and finally digested into a single complete Statute. This work, no doubt, may and should be done so as to leave the legal effect unaltered; at the same time it will demand a somewhat larger measure of confidence on the part of Parliament to accept these latter consolidations on trust, as being merely changes in the form and arrangement of existing legislation, and no more. As examples of Acts of the second class which might be thus dealt with, the following may be specified:—

SUBJECT of ACTS of the Second Class.

Aliens.	Highways.	Public Schools.
Apportionment.	Judgments.	Registration.
Copyright.	Limitation and Prescription.	Salmon Fisheries.
Gaming and Betting.	Mortmain.	Turnpikes.

With

With respect to the mode of bringing the Bills before Parliament it has occurred to me that a compendious method might be adopted, if not objected to as an innovation in form, which would save much time and trouble to the Legislature, as well as to those charged with the duty of passing the consolidations into law. The necessity of carrying a dozen or more separate Bills through both Houses, stage by stage, would involve much repetition of formal motions, and a multiplicity of votes, notices, and entries. To obviate this inconvenience, I would suggest that all the consolidations, at least of the first class of subjects, should be embodied, when introduced, in one Bill, divided into as many Parts as there are separate subjects to be consolidated. In this shape the Bill might be carried through the first House, and proceed as far as the second reading in the second, the Committee of which, in pursuance of an instruction to that effect, might divide the Bill into as many separate Bills as it contained Parts, each Part being afterwards read a third time and passed as a separate Act, in which shape it would appear in the Statute Book.

It would of course be competent to either House, during the passage of the Bill, to strike out any one or more of the Parts, just as clauses of a Bill are struck out at present.

The above suggestion is only offered for what it is worth, and subject to the opinion of those best qualified to judge from their knowledge of Parliamentary procedure. It presupposes as an essential condition to such a mode of legislation, that the Bill would be proposed to Parliament with an official assurance that it contained no alteration whatever of the substance of the law, but merely of form and arrangement. Such a guarantee would probably induce the Legislature to accept the Bill, in like manner as it has for several years past accepted the successive Statute Law Revision Bills in faith of the official sanction with which they have been introduced, but seldom raising any question as to their contents.

January 1875.

G. K. Rickards.

SCHEDULE 1.

Adulteration.
Accidents—Compensation.
Affirmations (Scotland).
Aliens.
Alkali Works.
Anatomy Schools.
Anchors (*see* Chain Cables).
Apportionment.
Attornies and Solicitors.
Benefices (Augmentation).
Betting.
Bills of Exchange (Summary Procedure).
Bills of Sale.
Bridges.
Carriers.
Cheques.
Chimney Sweepers Regulation.
Chain Cables and Anchors.
Civil Offices—Pensions.
Civil Bills (Ireland).
Charitable Bequests (Ireland).
Churchyards, Consecration of.
Cinque Ports—Administration of Justice.
Colonial Governors' Pensions.
Colonial Attornies.
Conjugal Rights (Scotland).
Copyholds.
Copyright—Books, Music, Designs, &c.
County Property.
County Courts.
Detached Parts of Counties.
Dilapidations.
Dogs (Ireland).

Emigration.
Endowed Schools.
Evidence, Law of.
Extradition.
Factories.
Fairs.
Fishery.
Flax and Linen Manufactures (Ireland).
Foreign Jurisdiction.
Foreign Enlistment.
Gas, Sale of (Scotland).
Gaming.
House of Commons, Writs during Recess.
—————Committees of Oaths and
Costs.
—————Officers.
Highways.
Income Tax.
Industrial and Provident Societies.
Industrial Schools.
Judgments.
Labourers' Dwellings (England).
————— (Ireland).
Land Drainage and Improvement (England
and Wales).
Land Drainage and Improvement (Ireland).
Land for Charitable Uses.
Leases and Sales of Settled Estates.
Libel.
Libraries, Public (England and Wales).
————— (Scotland).
Life Assurance.
Limitation and Prescription.

Lodging

Lodging Houses (England).
 (Ireland).

Locomotives on Roads.

Lunatics, Pauper.

Lunatic Asylums, Private (Ireland).

Married Women's Property.

Matrimonial Causes and Divorce.

Medical Practitioners.

Merchant Shipping.

Metropolitan Commons.

Mortgage Debentures.

Mortmain.

Naturalization (*see* Aliens).

Parliament, Time for Summoning.

Patents.

Penal Servitude.

Pharmacy—Chemists and Druggists.

Poisoned Grain and other Substances.

Prescription (*see* Limitations).

Prisons (Scotland).

Public Schools.

Petitions of Right.

Railways—Abandonments.

Railways—Lands Clauses (Ireland).

Registration (England and Wales).

Registration (Scotland).

Sanitary Law.

Salmon Fisheries (England and Wales).
 (Ireland).

Secretaries of State—Seats in Parliament.

Sheriffs' Courts (Scotland).

Stipendiary Magistrates.

Superannuation.

Telegraphs.

Treasury Chest.

Tramways (Ireland).

Trustees (England and Wales).

(Scotland).

Turnpikes.

Valuation (Scotland).

Valuation (Ireland).

Vaccination (England and Wales).

(Ireland).

Vice-Admiralty Courts.

Volunteers.

United Parishes (Scotland).

University Election—Voting Papers.

Union Assessment Committees.

Weights and Measures (Ireland).

SCHEDULE 2.

1. *Alkali Works.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 26 & 27 Vict. c. 124. It consists of 19 sections.
- (2.) The 31 & 32 Vict. c. 36 (1 section only), makes the above Act perpetual, repealing the 19th section.
- (3.) The 37 & 38 Vict. c. 43 (10 sections), alters some of the definitions of the principal Act, and makes further provisions. These Acts are to be construed together.
- (4.) The Public Health Act, 1872, 35 & 36 Vict. c. 79, by s. 35, transfers the powers vested in the Board of Trade by the principal Act to the Local Government Board.

2. *Bill of Sale.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36. It consists of 8 sections, and provides for the registration of bills of sale.
- (2.) The only amending Act is 29 & 30 Vict. c. 96. It consists of 11 sections, and enacts that "the principal Act and this Act shall be construed together."

3. *Chain Cables and Anchors.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 27 & 28 Vict. c. 27 (Chain Cable and Anchor Act, 1864), made perpetual by 35 & 36 Vict. c. 30 (*infra*). This Act consists of 15 sections, and regulates the proving and sale of chain cables and anchors.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 34 & 35 Vict. c. 101 (Chain Cable and Anchor Act, 1871). This consists of 11 sections; it amends and partly repeals the principal Act.
- (3.) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 30 (1 section), suspends the operation of the above Acts until 1st January 1873.
- (4.) 37 & 38 Vict. c. 51 (8 sections), amends the foregoing Acts in certain particulars, and directs that they shall be construed as one.

4. *Charitable Bequests (Ireland).*

- (1.) The principal Act is 7 & 8 Vict. c. 97 (An Act for the more effectual application of charitable donations and bequests in Ireland). It consists of 23 sections, and provides for the appointment and jurisdiction of commissioners.

The amending Statutes are—

- (2.) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 111, which merely repeals the principal Act as to the appointment of a certain judge as commissioner.

- (3.) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 50 (24 sections), which extends the principal Act as to the powers of the Charity Commissioners.
- (4.) 34 & 35 Vict. c. 102 (17 sections), which amends and partly repeals the Acts as to the powers of commissioners. The above are to be construed together.

5. *Colonial Governors (Retiring Pensions).*

- (1.) The principal Act is 28 & 29 Vict. c. 113. It consists of 13 sections, and authorises the payment of retiring pensions to colonial governors.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 29 (3 sections), which gives power to grant an increase of reduced rate of pensions.
- (3.) And 31 & 32 Vict. c. 128 (1 section), which provides that a commissioner of Ionian Islands may be considered a colonial governor for the purpose of the principal Act.

6. *Extradition.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 33 & 34 Vict. c. 52. It consists of 27 sections, and provides for the extradition of persons accused of crime committed in foreign states (with which states arrangements shall be made), or of crimes at sea.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 60 (8 sections). It explains certain sections of the principal Act, and makes some further provisions.
- (3.) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 88 (Slave Trade Consolidation Act), by s. 27 provides that offences committed against this Act or the enactments with which this Act is to be construed as one, or otherwise in connection with the slave trade, whether committed on the high seas or on land, or partly on the high seas or partly on land, shall be deemed to be inserted in the first schedule to the Extradition Act, 1870, and that Act and any Act amending the same shall be construed accordingly.

7. *Foreign Jurisdiction.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 6 & 7 Vict. c. 94 (Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1843). It consists of 9 sections, and provides that the power acquired by Her Majesty in countries out of Her dominions shall be held on the same terms as Her Majesty's authority in the Crown colonies; with ancillary clauses as to power to send persons charged with crimes for trial to a British colony, and power to send convicts for execution or imprisonment to a British colony, and limitation of actions.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 28 & 29 Vict. c. 116 (Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1865), (2 sections), which explains the phrase "British colony" in the principal Act to include any of Her Majesty's possessions.
- (3.) 29 & 30 Vict. c. 87 (Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1866), (2 sections), which extends the principal Act by giving power to the Queen in Council to assign jurisdiction to courts in British dominions in cases within Foreign Jurisdiction Acts. The above Acts are to be construed together.

8. *House of Commons. Issuing of Writs during Recess.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 24 Geo. 3, c. 26 (now 8 sections only), which provides for the election of members during a recess.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 21 & 22 Vict. c. 110 (6 sections), which extends the principal Act to the case of recess whether by prorogation or adjournment of Parliament.
- (3.) And 26 & 27 Vict. c. 20 (1 section). By which six days' notice is made sufficient in the above two Acts.

9. *Leases and Sales of Settled Estates.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 19 & 20 Vict. c. 120. It consists of 46 sections, and provides for the leasing or selling of settled estates in proper cases, for 21 years, by a tenant for life, without application to the Court of Chancery, and in other cases on petition.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 21 & 22 Vict. c. 77 (8 sections).
- (3.) 25 & 26 Vict. c. 108 (3 sections), which contains confirmation of past sales made, with exception of minerals.
- (4.) 27 & 28 Vict. c. 45 (5 sections), which is to be construed with the other Acts.
- (5.) 37 & 38 Vict. c. 33 (4 sections), which amends the practice as to notices and consents.

10. *Medical Practitioners.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 21 & 22 Vict. c. 90. It consists of 55 sections, and incorporates and settles the powers and constitution of medical councils, and provides for examination and registry of, and privileges of, qualified medical practitioners.

The amending Statutes are—

- (2.) 22 Vict. c. 21 (6 sections), amending and partly repealing the principal Act.
 (3.) 23 Vict. c. 7 (6 sections), which adds divers new provisions.
 (4.) 23 & 24 Vict. c. 66. "An Act to amend the Medical Act, 1858," (6 sections), which contains an interpretation clause, and empowers new charters to be granted to certain corporations of physicians.
 (5.) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 29 (3 sections), which applies the Medical Acts to the colonies.
 (6.) 36 & 37 Vict. c. 55 (2 sections), and which slightly amends the Medical Act as to the University of London.

11. *Naturalisation.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 33 & 34 Vict. c. 14. It consists of 18 sections.
 (2.) The amending Acts are c. 102, of the same Session (3 sections).
 (3.) 35 & 36 Vict. c. 39 (3 sections).

12. *Parliament (Summoning).*

- (1.) The principal Act is 37 Geo. 3, c. 127. It consists now of 4 sections only, and enacts, "His Majesty may summon Parliament in fourteen days," and provides for summoning Parliament in case of demise of Crown.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 39 & 40 Geo. 3, c. 14. This consists now of 2 sections only, and extends the principal Act to cases of adjournment of Parliament.
 (3.) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 81, by which the period of six days is substituted for the period of fourteen named in the principal Act.

13. *Parliament (Powers of Committees as to Oaths and Costs).*

The Acts to be consolidated are—

- (1.) 21 & 22 Vict. c. 78 (3 sections), by which any House of Lords Committee may administer oaths [it has been repealed as to the Commons].
 (2.) 28 & 29 Vict. c. 27 (11 sections), which provides for the awarding of costs by Committees against promoters of Private Bills when the preamble is not proved, and the taxation thereof.
 (3.) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 136 (3 sections). By which Courts of Referees on Private Bills may administer oaths.
 (4.) 34 & 35 Vict. c. 83. By which the House of Commons and any Committee thereof may administer oaths.

14. *Pharmacy (Chemists and Druggists).*

- (1.) The principal Act is 15 & 16 Vict. c. 56, which consists of 16 sections, and incorporates the Society of Pharmaceutical Chemists, and provides for examination and registry of such chemists, and the sale of poisons.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 121 (Pharmacy Act, 1868), (28 sections), which makes some additional provisions for the above purposes.
 (3.) 32 & 33 Vict. c. 117 (5 sections), which amends the fourth section and the schedule of the Act of 1868.

15. *Railways Abandonment.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 13 & 14 Vict. c. 83. It consists of 40 sections, and empowers the Commissioners of Railways, upon the application of a railway company, to authorise, under certain prescribed conditions, the abandonment of the undertaking. It also provides for the winding up of the company.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 126. Railway Companies (Scotland) Act, 1867, sections 31, 35.
 (3.) 30 & 31 Vict. c. 127. Railway Companies Act, 1867, sections 31-35, which contains further provisions as to abandonment and winding up.
 (4.) The 32 & 33 Vict. c. 114 (10 sections). Abandonment of Railways Act, 1869, to be construed as one with the foregoing Acts, of which it amends the provisions in certain particulars, and repeals some sections.

16. *Trustee Relief Act.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 10 & 11 Vict. c. 96 (6 sections), by which trustees are empowered to pay trust moneys or to transfer stock and securities into the Court of Chancery, and the Court of Chancery may make orders on petitions, without bill, for application of trust moneys and administration of trusts.
- (2.) The amending Act is 12 & 13 Vict. c. 74 (2 sections), by which the Court of Chancery may, upon application by the majority of trustees, &c., order payment or transfer of trust moneys, stocks, or securities into the Court of Chancery.

17. *Trustee Acts.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 13 & 14 Vict. c. 60 (Trustee Act, 1850), (60 sections). A consolidation Act, which empowers the court to convey or make vesting orders of a legal estate outstanding in trustees or mortgagees who are infant, lunatic, &c.
- (2.) The amending Act is 15 & 16 Vict. c. 55 (13 sections), which amends and extends the provisions of the principal Act in various respects, and is by s. 12 to be construed as if it had formed part thereof. The two might easily be incorporated in one.

The subject is distinct from all other Acts relating to trustees.

18. *Vaccination (England).*

- (1.) The principal Act is 30 & 31 Vict. c. 84 (Vaccination Act, 1867). It consists of 37 sections.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 34 & 35 Vict. c. 98 (1871), (17 sections), which repeals certain parts of the principal Act, makes sundry additional provisions and amendments, and is to be construed as one therewith.
- (3.) And 37 & 38 Vict. c. 75 (2 sections), which explains s. 2 of the Act of 1871.

19. *Vaccination (Ireland).*

- (1.) The principal Act is 14 & 15 Vict. c. 68. It consists of 22 sections, and is a general Act for the better distribution, support, and management of the medical charities in Ireland.

Section 13 contains regulations as to vaccination and applies 3 & 4 Vict. c. 29, which was repealed by 30 & 31 Vict. c. 84.

The amending Acts are—

- (2.) 21 & 22 Vict. c. 64 (6 sections), which amends the principal Act, and provides for the expenses of vaccination.
- (3.) 26 & 27 Vict. c. 52 (13 sections), which contains further provisions on the same subject, and makes vaccination compulsory.
- (4.) 31 & 32 Vict. c. 87 (4 sections), which is to be read as one with Act (3).
- (5.) "The Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1874," 37 & 38 Vict. c. 93, s. 58, contains a further provision as to vaccination.

20. *Vice Admiralty Courts.*

- (1.) The principal Act is 26 & 27 Vict. c. 24 (Vice Admiralty Courts, 1863). It consists of 24 sections, and constitutes Vice Admiralty Courts.
- (2.) The amending Act is 30 & 31 Vict. c. 45 (1867), (18 sections), which extends and amends the principal Act, and is to be read as one therewith.

— No. 9. —

The Lord Chancellor to the Treasury.

Sir

House of Lords, 19 March 1875.

I AM directed by the Lord Chancellor to acquaint you, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, with reference to your letter to him of 15th August 1874, that his Lordship has, through the Statute Law Committee, obtained a Report respecting consolidation of Statutes, and has received from the Committee a further Memorandum on that subject.

I am to enclose copies of the Report and Memorandum, and to state to you that the Lord Chancellor concurs generally in the Memorandum.

I am therefore to request you to move their Lordships to approve of the proposed expenditure of 200 guineas, under the superintendence of the Statute Law Committee.

I am, &c.

(signed) *Henry J. L. Graham,*
Principal Secretary.

The Secretary, Treasury,
Whitehall.

— No. 10. —

EXTRACT from MINUTES.

Monday, 22 March 1875.

1. THE Committee discussed the proposed arrangements for supervising the consolidation of the Statutes on the subjects mentioned in their Memorandum for the Lord Chancellor of 1st March 1875.

Resolved,—

(a.) That each member of the Committee should take a group of the subjects proposed, and communicate with Mr. Rickards relative to the Consolidation Bills for that group, before the Bills are brought before the Committee itself;

(b.) That each Draft Bill be prepared in the first instance, by the cutting out and putting together mechanically, with pen and ink alterations, of the sections of the Acts consolidated;

(c.) That the respective member of the Committee should see each Consolidation Bill in its original draft thus prepared, so as to be able to ascertain without difficulty the exact extent of change made, before the draft is put into fresh print;

(d.) That there be two copies made of each Bill in the draft form, as described, so that one may be kept as a record, while the other is used for the press.

2. The Committee divided the proposed subjects of consolidation among the several members.

* * * * *

— No. 11. —

The Treasury to the Lord Chancellor.

My Lord,

Treasury Chambers, 29 March 1875.

I AM desired by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to acquaint your Lordship, in reply to Mr. Henry Graham's letter of the 19th instant, that they are pleased to sanction payment of a sum, not exceeding Two hundred guineas, to Mr. Rickards, for his services in preparing certain proposed Consolidation Bills under the superintendence of the Statute Law Committee, such sum to be considered as covering remuneration to Mr. Rickards, and the payments to his assistants, and other expenses.

£. 210.

I am, &c.

(signed) *William Law.*

The Right Hon. The Lord Chancellor,
&c. &c. &c.

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES.

COPY of MINUTES and MEMORANDA of the
STATUTE LAW COMMITTEE on the Subject of
CONSOLIDATION of the STATUTES, with CORRE-
SPONDENCE consequent thereupon.

(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
20 April 1875.

COUNTY COURTS.

201

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 15 March 1875;—for,

“RETURN, from every COUNTY COURT in *England* and *Wales*, of the Total Number of PLAINTS; &c., entered in each Court, from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December 1874, both days inclusive; distinguishing those not exceeding £. 20; those above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50; and those by Agreement above £. 50 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 117, of Session 1874).”

(*Mr. Norwood.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
9 April 1875.

RETURN, from every COUNTY COURT in *England* and *Wales*, of the Total Number of PLAINTS, & inclusive; distinguishing those not exceeding £.20; those above £.20 and not exceeding £.50; and

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrant of Committ.
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.
CIRCUIT 1.														
(1)	Alnwick - - -	205	6	0	1	94	79	9	3	3	1	8	5	2
(2)	Belford - - -	13	1	0	0	12	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
(3)	Bellingham - - -	32	1	0	0	16	14	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
(4)	Berwick - - -	116	2	0	0	42	23	15	0	3	1	4	4	2
(5)	Gateshead - - -	1,807	29	0	3	1,277	921	309	6	31	13	245	175	88
(6)	Hexham - - -	186	11	1	1	82	57	18	1	5	2	7	3	0
(7)	Morpeth - - -	510	21	0	0	301	217	61	2	13	8	66	39	22
(8)	Newcastle - - -	4,294	153	2	21	2,354	1,473	750	70	42	40	392	212	128
(9)	North Shields - - -	1,714	30	0	0	1,210	848	321	8	20	13	298	181	101
(10)	Rothbury - - -	50	5	0	0	31	25	3	0	1	2	3	0	0
(11)	Wooler - - -	55	2	0	0	27	22	1	0	2	2	6	4	4
TOTALS - - -		8,982	261	3	26	5,446	3,687	1,492	91	120	82	1,030	624	348
CIRCUIT 2.														
(1)	Bishop Auckland - - -	2,047	45	0	2	1,294	895	359	9	16	17	107	48	27
(2)	Durham - - -	3,305	35	0	6	2,058	1,612	389	7	13	43	129	68	28
(3)	Hartlepool - - -	1,888	31	0	2	1,230	891	296	13	12	20	107	48	19
(4)	Seaham Harbour - - -	914	1	0	0	624	453	163	2	5	1	47	28	16
(5)	Shotley Bridge - - -	1,191	26	0	0	727	590	112	2	13	10	73	36	16
(6)	South Shields - - -	2,696	53	0	2	1,773	1,276	443	20	16	20	315	129	67
(7)	Sunderland - - -	4,633	78	0	2	3,182	2,052	1,023	20	40	49	451	261	140
(8)	Wolsingham - - -	236	7	0	0	122	88	28	3	0	3	18	6	4
TOTALS - - -		16,910	276	0	14	11,010	7,857	2,813	76	115	163	1,247	624	317
CIRCUIT 3.														
(1)	Alston - - -	51	2	0	0	37	19	17	0	1	0	0	0	0
(2)	Ambleside - - -	350	9	0	0	176	123	44	2	1	6	63	50	27
(3)	Appleby - - -	184	9	0	1	90	50	26	5	2	8	13	4	2
(4)	Brampton - - -	273	5	0	1	114	88	24	1	0	2	32	16	4
(5)	Carlisle - - -	1,118	68	0	0	663	405	214	15	8	21	127	58	27
(6)	Cockermouth - - -	1,253	36	0	0	803	490	264	6	25	18	183	108	81
(7)	Haltwhistle - - -	79	2	0	0	28	2	1	23	1	1	6	1	1
(8)	Keswick - - -	132	6	0	0	58	48	8	0	1	1	8	4	0
(9)	Kirkby Kendal - - -	1,078	16	0	3	606	492	88	3	3	23	194	104	45
(10)	Kirkby Lonsdale - - -	211	7	0	1	108	70	27	3	4	5	20	7	3
(11)	Penrith - - -	693	22	0	2	360	298	49	7	4	4	58	24	6
(12)	Settle - - -	91	5	0	2	41	31	6	2	2	2	30	12	11
(13)	Ulverston and Barrow-in-Furness.	2,964	70	1	7	1,909	1,300	521	25	21	49	352	233	173
(14)	Whitehaven - - -	2,238	56	0	4	1,389	1,032	301	9	11	40	364	222	166
(15)	Wigton - - -	603	16	0	1	236	149	67	1	7	13	41	17	13
TOTALS - - -		11,318	329	1	22	6,618	4,597	1,657	102	91	193	1,491	860	559

entered in each Court, from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December 1874, both days those by Agreement above £. 50 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 117, of Session 1874).

Executions against Goods.	Sales made.	Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceedings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Proceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composition Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
							Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
						£.	£.	£.	£.							
31	2	0	0	0	4	917	401	125	110	0	0	0	0	0	1 interpleader.	(1)
3	0	0	0	0	4	126	100	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
5	1	0	0	0	4	165	73	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
11	2	0	0	0	5	626	193	49	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
300	2	0	8	0	15	4,892	2,238	119	758	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
19	0	0	0	0	5	1,057	349	43	110	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
63	2	0	0	0	12	2,141	996	124	276	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
774	5	2	0	1	82	22,005	8,097	577	2,484	4	36	38	184	65	0	(8)
302	0	0	0	0	11	5,181	2,919	307	760	1	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
6	0	0	0	0	4	333	140	8	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
11	0	0	0	0	3	277	90	12	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
525	14	2	8	1	149	37,720	15,596	1,368	4,668	8	36	38	184	65	1	
284	33	0	0	0	20	6,716	2,287	166	880	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
524	5	0	0	0	22	8,631	4,712	244	1,212	2	0	1	24	5	0	(2)
17	20	0	0	0	14	6,212	3,474	180	899	5	16	0	0	0	1 precept under 35 & 36 Vict. c. 80, and 1 case under 36 & 37 Vict. c. 52.	(3)
175	1	0	0	0	6	1,571	1,065	18	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
190	10	0	0	1	11	3,883	2,149	102	557	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
385	5	0	0	0	23	7,609	4,323	470	1,024	2	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
106	8	0	0	0	38	14,601	8,146	179	2,095	4	11	10	84	19	0	(7)
19	0	0	0	0	6	930	365	22	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
100	82	0	0	1	140	50,153	26,521	1,381	7,020	13	27	11	108	24	2	
7	0	0	0	0	6	229	124	7	26	0	0	0	0	0	1, taking acknowledgments from married women.	(1)
75	0	0	0	0	6	1,203	563	45	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
23	0	0	0	0	6	897	199	21	115	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
48	0	0	0	0	6	901	369	19	117	1	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
278	4	0	0	0	11	5,913	3,133	176	705	0	0	2	22	4	0	(5)
302	10	0	0	0	11	4,310	2,131	184	639	3	0	1	10	0	2 executions against goods from Courts other than County Court.	(6)
13	0	0	0	0	6	245	110	15	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
15	0	0	0	0	6	495	231	26	71	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
471	5	0	0	0	11	2,980	1,494	80	488	2	0	2	7	6	0	(9)
42	2	0	0	0	6	1,114	393	30	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
111	0	0	0	0	11	3,240	1,399	155	402	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
16	0	0	0	0	5	432	206	33	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
754	3	0	0	0	12	11,218	5,733	281	1,636	3	0	6	42	16	6 warrants from Salford Hundred Court.	(13)
551	14	0	0	0	11	7,143	4,026	317	1,107	2	4	3	20	1	0	(14)
53	5	0	0	0	11	1,856	783	75	216	2	0	0	0	0	0	(15)
759	43	0	0	0	125	42,176	20,894	1,464	5,916	15	4	14	101	27	9	

		Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrant of Commitment.	
	COURT TOWN.	Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 93, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	
	CIRCUIT 4.														
(1)	Bacup - - -	1,425	12	0	0	899	479	320	20	49	31	88	56	16	
(2)	Blackburn - -	4,055	94	0	4	2,576	1,516	822	53	124	65	380	188	77	
(3)	Chorley - - -	961	18	0	0	594	352	202	9	22	9	49	20	3	
(4)	Garstang - - -	96	3	0	0	47	23	21	0	3	0	8	2	1	
(5)	Haslingden and Accrington.	1,085	31	0	0	592	307	242	2	30	11	91	36	13	
(6)	Kirkham - - -	145	4	0	1	73	49	17	1	4	3	14	8	1	
(7)	Lancaster - - -	525	13	0	0	326	183	121	6	7	9	63	21	8	
(8)	Poulton-le-Fylde -	472	24	0	0	208	139	43	5	12	9	18	4	2	
(9)	Preston - - - -	2,186	53	0	4	1,157	647	366	89	29	30	149	59	22	
	TOTALS - - -	10,950	252	0	9	6,472	3,695	2,154	185	280	167	865	394	143	
	CIRCUIT 5.														
(1)	Bolton - - - -	7,875	30	0	10	5,398	3,476	1,828	19	10	75	478	191	107	
(2)	Bury - - - -	2,600	99	0	1	1,637	820	712	33	6	67	394	197	69	
(3)	Oldham - - - -	3,314	55	1	10	1,991	1,152	713	36	23	77	169	59	27	
(4)	Rochdale - - -	2,316	50	0	0	1,541	897	560	18	16	50	150	86	35	
	TOTALS - - -	16,105	174	1	21	10,567	6,345	3,813	106	55	269	1,191	533	238	
	CIRCUIT 6.														
(1)	Liverpool - - -	22,597	384	0	50	14,130	8,162	5,116	308	396	198	2,065	1,196	197	
(2)	Ormskirk - - -	917	53	0	0	410	300	57	9	31	13	131	73	22	
(3)	St. Helen's - -	4,175	30	0	3	2,906	1,856	979	22	44	8	942	635	108	
	TOTALS - - -	27,689	467	0	53	17,446	10,318	6,152	339	471	219	3,138	1,904	327	
	CIRCUIT 7.														
(1)	Altrincham - -	1,524	33	0	6	818	558	211	9	32	14	396	171	73	
(2)	Birkenhead - -	5,876	85	0	10	3,275	1,780	1,406	24	47	28	919	564	233	
(3)	Leigh - - - -	1,974	10	0	3	1,269	853	379	7	28	5	370	218	132	
(4)	Northwich - - -	2,085	40	0	9	1,239	850	364	5	18	11	431	313	193	
(5)	Runcorn - - - -	1,358	25	0	2	895	389	480	9	12	7	323	192	96	
(6)	Warrington - - -	4,314	50	0	1	3,099	1,143	1,908	2	32	15	1,585	1,096	564	
(7)	Wigan - - - -	5,964	71	0	9	2,877	1,501	1,264	11	88	22	2,265	1,525	793	
	TOTALS - - -	23,095	314	0	40	13,472	7,074	6,012	67	257	102	6,289	4,079	2,084	

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
						£.	£.	£.	£.							
364	4	0	0	0	13	3,341	1,245	55	499	0	0	0	0	0	2	(1)
1,170	80	2	0	0	48	14,818	7,744	312	2,001	3	0	4	61	23	14 executions from Salford Hundred Court.	(2)
237	11	0	0	0	13	3,102	170	35	450	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
12	0	0	0	0	9	305	216	6	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
213	5	0	0	0	14	4,397	2,021	104	539	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
23	1	0	0	0	9	569	216	6	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
119	0	0	0	0	14	2,000	1,166	42	286	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
55	1	0	0	0	13	2,597	811	54	272	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
560	12	0	0	0	25	7,948	3,682	171	1,008	1	3	7	47	4	0	(9)
2,803	114	2	0	0	158	39,077	17,271	785	5,173	6	3	11	108	27	16	
3,456	135	0	0	0	33	16,288	10,879	112	2,336	3	0	7	87	11	0	(1)
1,166	48	0	0	0	22	7,266	3,619	115	1,087	2	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
1,111	13	0	0	0	24	9,367	5,136	192	1,321	1	0	11	55	18	0	(3)
608	42	0	0	0	22	6,996	4,017	182	1,043	5	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
6,541	238	0	0	0	101	39,917	23,651	601	6,287	11	0	18	142	29	0	
4,265	63	2	0	0	300	72,169	37,827	1,484	10,447	9	68	58	272	163	11 interpleaders	(1)
106	1	0	0	1	14	4,873	1,155	82	550	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
1,160	20	0	0	1	24	10,472	6,493	156	1,687	2	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
5,531	84	2	0	2	338	87,514	45,415	1,722	12,684	11	68	58	272	163	11	
286	4	0	0	0	12	4,594	2,094	208	640	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
848	11	0	0	0	35	14,518	7,532	468	1,977	6	0	6	42	15	1, Married Women Acknowledgment. 1, Friendly Society	(2)
554	43	0	0	0	11	4,685	3,111	70	810	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
529	6	0	0	0	15	5,557	3,232	205	839	5	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
396	5	0	0	0	11	3,989	2,097	118	581	3	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
955	4	0	0	0	18	10,276	6,339	194	1,567	2	0	3	36	6	0	(6)
1,006	44	1	0	0	33	18,023	12,115	226	3,134	2	0	3	27	5	0	(7)
5,174	117	1	0	0	135	61,642	36,520	1,489	9,548	20	0	12	105	26	2	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by default, s. 23, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or sect. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
	CIRCUIT 8.														
(1)	Manchester - -	14,395	174	1	3	8,727	5,926	2,272	109	217	206	1,190	570	190	3
(2)	Salford - - -	10,220	71	0	0	7,164	4,019	2,848	26	90	181	931	545	121	44
	TOTALS - - -	24,615	245	1	3	15,891	9,945	5,120	135	307	387	2,121	1,115	311	77
	CIRCUIT 9.														
(1)	Ashton-under-Lyne -	4,683	45	0	1	2,950	1,963	903	18	32	35	1,219	730	414	78
(2)	Congleton and Sandbach	1,531	17	0	1	715	473	218	1	8	16	118	46	22	6
(3)	Hyde - - -	1,864	28	0	4	1,162	760	376	5	7	18	288	164	102	27
(4)	Macclesfield - -	1,948	27	0	1	999	561	400	5	13	21	181	76	35	20
(5)	Nantwich and Crewe	1,633	22	0	0	817	632	133	11	22	19	203	128	67	4
(6)	Stockport - -	3,529	60	0	0	2,049	1,289	679	4	28	49	491	275	101	17
(7)	Whitchurch - -	470	15	0	1	189	139	41	0	7	3	36	22	6	1
	TOTALS - - -	15,658	214	0	8	8,881	5,817	2,750	44	117	161	2,536	1,441	747	153
	CIRCUIT 11.														
(1)	Bradford - - -	7,840	246	1	4	4,701	3,115	1,204	228	98	60	180	73	21	12
(2)	Burnley - - -	1,712	72	1	2	1,223	595	551	25	38	16	174	54	27	7
(3)	Clitheroe - -	280	15	0	1	169	93	52	3	9	13	19	5	6	1
(4)	Colne - - -	278	24	0	0	159	95	46	5	9	4	14	9	0	0
(5)	Keighley - -	847	31	0	0	486	269	177	14	15	11	25	10	1	1
(6)	Otley - - -	886	25	0	2	434	310	79	25	15	7	22	9	5	2
(7)	Skipton - - -	395	16	0	0	210	149	38	6	5	12	12	11	4	0
(8)	Todmorden - -	607	25	0	0	313	154	117	20	8	14	49	26	■	3
	TOTALS - - -	12,845	454	2	9	7,695	4,780	2,264	326	197	137	495	197	72	26
	CIRCUIT 12.														
(1)	Dewsbury - -	7,636	115	0	0	4,976	2,363	2,376	53	147	37	698	544	287	52
(2)	Halifax - - -	7,975	136	0	2	4,679	2,793	1,652	124	82	30	679	335	205	32
(3)	Holmfirth - -	630	9	0	3	392	240	136	2	6	11	47	26	18	7
(4)	Huddersfield - -	4,934	110	0	3	3,309	1,522	1,630	83	58	19	308	221	104	27
(5)	Pontefract - -	3,080	47	0	9	1,964	1,242	578	60	89	4	385	281	160	31
(6)	Saddleworth - -	335	6	0	0	200	82	103	1	8	6	31	17	5	0
	TOTALS - - -	24,590	423	0	17	15,520	8,242	6,475	323	390	107	2,148	1,424	779	149

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summonses in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
910	31	1	5	0	92	£ 37,711	£ 19,513	£ 492	£ 5,262	5	0	47	267	111	1 petition under the Industrial and Pro- vident Societies Acts, 1862 and 1867.	(1)
354	63	0	1	1	35	19,743	12,757	139	3,138	2	0	14	99	24	0	(2)
5,264	94	1	6	1	127	57,454	32,270	631	8,400	7	0	61	366	135	1	
1,037	57	0	0	0	35	11,011	6,397	191	1,720	6	0	4	21	11	9	(1)
27	8	0	0	0	17	3,694	1,535	39	396	2	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
352	6	0	0	0	24	5,113	2,531	91	708	3	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
406	9	0	0	0	15	5,333	2,281	120	647	3	0	5	34	4	0	(4)
355	14	0	0	0	23	3,936	1,892	88	581	0	0	4	27	5	0	(5)
660	16	0	0	1	30	9,600	4,723	261	1,321	2	0	4	28	8	0	(6)
48	4	0	0	0	6	1,895	644	39	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
2,885	114	0	0	1	150	40,582	20,003	829	5,566	16	0	17	110	28	9	
1,616	71	0	0	0	82	32,474	14,313	946	3,854	14	0	35	172	87	0	(1)
414	29	0	0	0	21	7,114	4,177	195	876	1	0	2	31	11	6, Intestates Widows and Children Act. 3, "Borough and Local Courts of Record Act."	(2)
51	0	0	0	0	9	1,355	752	58	172	0	0	0	0	0	2 warrants of <i>Fi. Fa.</i> from Salford Hun- dred Court.	(3)
52	0	0	0	0	8	1,846	708	100	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
170	2	0	0	0	11	3,503	929	116	447	3	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
173	6	0	0	0	11	3,370	1,556	120	439	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
76	2	0	0	0	9	1,942	848	122	253	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
146	1	0	0	0	12	2,690	1,066	39	310	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
2,698	111	0	0	0	163	54,294	24,349	1,696	6,544	21	0	37	203	98	11	
1,885	34	0	0	0	45	20,016	10,983	230	2,770	1	0	7	113	25	0	(1)
1,833	79	0	0	0	47	28,067	11,234	285	3,235	6	0	8	73	15	4 grants of Let- ters of Adminis- tration.	(2)
98	1	0	0	0	11	1,939	1,111	50	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
1,350	12	0	0	1	39	17,296	9,381	397	2,240	2	0	5	66	20	0	(4)
758	11	0	0	0	16	7,991	4,232	125	1,213	0	0	0	0	0	1 petition under the Industrial and Pro- vident Societies Act, 1862.	(5)
54	0	0	0	0	6	1,120	244	28	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
5,778	137	0	0	1	164	76,429	37,185	1,115	9,865	9	0	20	252	60	5	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £.20.	Above £.20 and not exceeding £.50.	By Agreement above £.50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 26, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 104, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
CIRCUIT 13.															
(1)	Glossop - - -	620	3	0	0	348	254	84	2	2	6	35	15	2	0
(2)	Rotherham - - -	3,547	47	0	3	2,464	1,477	915	47	14	14	277	95	32	9
(3)	Sheffield - - -	21,514	204	1	4	15,674	8,525	6,903	6	138	106	1,141	464	56	30
	TOTALS - - -	25,681	254	1	7	18,486	10,256	7,902	55	154	126	1,453	574	90	39
CIRCUIT 14.															
(1)	Barnsley - - -	4,973	106	0	11	3,058	2,105	855	10	79	20	473	255	184	12
(2)	Goole - - -	729	22	0	2	488	296	166	8	14	6	42	23	10	1
(3)	Leeds - - -	19,692	354	0	12	13,013	6,881	4,923	819	283	119	2,026	1,307	796	140
(4)	Wakefield - - -	3,866	83	0	1	2,320	1,309	862	57	65	28	383	286	187	30
	TOTALS - - -	29,260	565	0	26	18,879	10,591	6,806	894	441	173	2,924	1,871	1,177	183
CIRCUIT 15.															
(1)	Barnard Castle -	376	14	0	0	163	102	49	4	2	6	23	7	5	2
(2)	Darlington - - -	2,658	39	0	1	1,514	1,018	434	13	16	34	208	89	53	9
(3)	Easingwold - - -	120	10	0	2	66	37	18	3	1	9	10	2	2	1
(4)	Helmsley - - -	174	9	0	0	71	38	27	1	1	4	21	4	1	0
(5)	Knaresborough -	938	32	0	1	352	231	93	6	5	18	36	15	9	2
(6)	Leyburn - - -	128	7	0	0	65	20	32	3	0	10	1	0	0	0
(7)	Northallerton -	415	14	0	1	168	105	40	1	6	17	13	9	6	1
(8)	Richmond - - -	333	20	0	0	118	83	10	17	2	6	14	2	2	2
(9)	Ripon - - -	595	18	0	2	232	165	44	4	5	16	20	10	5	3
(10)	{ Stockton-on-Tees & } { Middlesborough - }	5,894	141	0	0	3,549	2,289	1,088	73	37	62	456	245	144	33
(11)	Stokesley - - -	954	16	0	1	502	343	135	8	3	14	98	44	21	2
(12)	Tadcaster - - -	389	10	0	0	190	122	51	3	4	10	23	9	6	2
(13)	Thirsk - - -	218	10	0	0	99	63	25	3	2	6	8	4	2	1
(14)	York - - -	1,676	122	0	4	702	406	182	80	10	28	103	46	26	4
	TOTALS - - -	14,868	462	0	12	7,791	5,022	2,228	219	94	240	1,034	486	282	62
CIRCUIT 16.															
(1)	Beverley - - -	389	13	0	1	190	124	55	3	2	7	42	11	2	0
(2)	Bridlington - - -	275	6	0	1	108	80	18	3	2	6	9	4	0	0
(3)	Great Driffield -	358	25	0	1	199	149	36	2	6	7	27	16	3	1
(4)	Hedon - - -	115	4	0	1	51	23	24	0	1	4	2	1	0	0
(5)	Howden - - -	357	5	0	4	187	120	58	0	3	10	15	9	3	3
(6)	Kingston-upon-Hull	7,142	195	0	13	4,457	2,958	1,092	269	78	73	839	335	65	9
(7)	New Malton - - -	788	14	0	1	395	278	84	8	7	19	43	23	3	2
(8)	Pecklington - - -	257	8	0	5	127	86	32	0	7	7	13	7	1	0
(9)	Scarborough - - -	1,113	24	0	1	483	282	157	17	10	18	83	28	6	0
(10)	Selby - - -	586	15	0	1	298	205	47	8	21	18	63	22	2	1
(11)	Whitby - - -	591	9	0	0	284	147	114	9	7	7	83	31	5	0
	TOTALS - - -	11,971	318	0	29	6,779	4,452	1,717	319	144	176	1,219	487	90	16

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceedings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Proceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composition Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
						£.	£.	£.	£.							
109	0	0	0	0	11	1,331	743	6	201	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
1,074	22	0	0	1	22	9,916	5,796	143	1,388	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
5,845	63	0	0	1	96	53,659	32,857	644	7,903	2	0	22	134	34	0	(3)
7,028	105	0	0	2	129	64,906	39,396	793	9,492	4	0	22	134	34	0	
1,307	19	0	0	0	26	14,577	7,512	191	1,984	2	0	0	9	3	0	(1)
163	4	0	0	0	7	2,505	1,219	45	322	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
5,089	80	2	0	1	80	64,125	31,952	763	8,844	15	0	17	202	66	13 grants of Letters of Administration, under the Widows and Childrens In-estate Act: 2 orders under the Ballot Act, 1872.	(3)
751	6	0	0	0	24	11,763	5,976	184	1,549	1	0	3	63	12	1	(4)
7,310	109	2	0	1	137	92,970	46,659	1,183	12,699	19	0	20	265	81	16	
54	2	0	0	0	6	1,525	698	36	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
502	16	0	0	0	14	6,787	3,128	537	887	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
20	0	0	0	0	6	773	424	28	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
17	1	0	0	0	5	859	483	37	87	3	0	0	0	0	1 garnishee sum- mons.	(4)
144	6	0	0	0	11	3,681	1,274	169	389	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
29	0	0	0	0	6	711	373	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
50	2	0	0	0	11	1,665	528	106	195	0	0	3	28	1	0	(7)
52	1	0	0	0	6	1,760	480	61	175	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
63	1	0	0	0	11	2,543	912	159	272	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
961	12	1	0	0	26	19,043	9,561	977	2,470	7	0	8	103	13	0	(10)
125	5	0	0	0	11	2,955	1,473	153	385	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
81	1	0	0	0	6	1,395	613	62	179	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
21	1	0	0	0	5	1,156	399	64	126	1	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
203	3	1	0	0	13	10,224	4,096	303	1,025	1	0	13	57	15	0	(14)
2,322	51	2	0	0	137	55,077	24,442	2,765	6,549	15	0	24	188	29	1	
73	1	0	0	0	7	1,429	558	28	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
19	3	0	0	0	8	1,223	428	33	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
46	0	0	0	0	6	1,803	725	70	185	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
14	0	0	2	0	6	574	102	29	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
43	4	0	0	0	6	1,332	580	78	171	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
1,999	29	1	1	0	87	24,961	11,403	420	3,038	6	33	9	79	20	0	(6)
100	1	0	0	0	11	2,643	1,150	102	336	3	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
40	0	0	0	0	6	999	403	46	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
229	0	0	0	0	11	3,948	1,146	66	440	3	0	6	45	9	0	(9)
106	1	0	0	0	11	2,088	717	86	260	2	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
143	2	0	0	0	11	1,752	812	80	232	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
2,212	41	1	3	0	170	42,752	18,024	1,038	5,139	15	33	15	124	29	0	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 23, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
CIRCUIT 17.															
(1)	Barton-on-Humber -	327	8	0	1	195	126	61	1	4	4	4	4	3	1
(2)	Boston - - -	1,542	41	0	1	783	442	279	12	24	27	280	146	94	19
(3)	Brigg - - -	526	8	0	1	311	212	72	7	11	10	33	17	24	
(4)	Caistor - - -	270	1	0	1	156	103	40	0	7	7	6	2	1	0
(5)	Gainsborough -	1,146	28	0	1	595	260	301	8	11	16	25	10	4	1
(6)	Great Grimsby -	1,738	73	0	6	1,110	715	285	62	35	19	315	115	75	9
(7)	Holbeach - - -	693	10	0	4	427	294	110	0	14	13	26	11	5	1
(8)	Horncastle - -	531	6	0	2	300	149	133	2	5	13	20	4	10	1
(9)	Lincoln - - -	2,082	44	0	5	1,061	621	368	17	28	32	169	83	54	8
(10)	Louth - - -	561	8	0	1	289	155	111	2	13	9	25	17	8	2
(11)	Market Rasen -	275	9	0	2	150	105	31	1	5	10	16	8	5	0
(12)	Sleaford - - -	525	18	0	0	283	214	50	3	13	3	22	10	3	1
(13)	Spalding - - -	836	29	0	0	416	261	123	5	16	11	41	24	14	3
(14)	Spilsby - - -	513	15	0	3	283	181	81	1	11	12	45	19	4	0
TOTALS - - -		11,565	298	0	28	6,359	3,838	2,045	121	197	186	1,027	470	304	47
CIRCUIT 18.															
(1)	Bingham - - -	183	1	0	0	118	92	12	2	10	2	9	8	6	2
(2)	Doncaster - - -	1,878	32	0	3	1,153	811	299	14	20	12	159	81	61	13
(3)	East Retford -	910	22	1	2	552	366	160	12	7	9	46	23	13	3
(4)	Mansfield - - -	851	16	1	1	528	333	150	9	18	19	49	30	17	0
(5)	Newark - - -	1,752	41	0	1	1,098	791	270	7	14	17	157	100	68	6
(6)	Nottingham - -	10,673	199	0	2	7,240	5,106	1,769	169	112	86	1,292	858	426	88
(7)	Thorne - - -	448	7	0	4	252	144	94	0	8	10	34	11	5	2
(8)	Worksop - - -	1,305	14	0	1	784	621	135	12	8	9	51	45	26	6
TOTALS - - -		18,000	332	2	14	11,725	8,264	2,889	225	197	164	1,797	1,156	622	120
CIRCUIT 19.															
(1)	Alfreton - - -	3,150	22	0	0	2,154	1,157	925	16	24	32	309	119	51	17
(2)	Ashbourne - - -	480	7	0	5	211	98	106	1	3	8	130	54	18	3
(3)	Bakewell - - -	430	9	0	3	225	86	122	7	2	11	50	15	9	0
(4)	Belper and Ilkeston	2,635	17	0	3	1,589	1,109	446	6	16	15	486	312	134	13
(5)	Burton-on-Trent -	3,302	34	0	2	2,420	1,324	1,041	16	13	28	613	409	142	34
(6)	Chapel-en-le-Frith and Buxton.	553	12	0	2	202	147	37	3	3	14	70	44	21	9
(7)	Chesterfield - -	4,078	50	0	8	2,888	2,068	719	15	53	41	588	331	140	29
(8)	Derby - - -	6,015	56	0	0	4,298	1,686	2,520	38	18	36	1,753	1,035	560	100
(9)	Wirksworth - - -	671	16	0	0	412	142	243	13	4	10	114	59	25	6
TOTALS - - -		21,314	223	0	23	14,399	7,817	6,159	115	136	195	4,113	2,378	1,100	211
CIRCUIT 20.															
(1)	Ashby-de-la-Zouch -	2,469	25	0	3	1,749	1,012	713	8	10	9	455	307	131	14
(2)	Bourn - - -	820	11	0	4	466	333	114	1	7	15	63	45	24	5
(3)	Grantham - - -	2,191	27	0	1	1,316	718	510	62	16	11	444	354	269	25
(4)	Hinckley - - -	617	5	0	3	308	254	40	4	5	8	80	58	39	7
(5)	Leicester - - -	9,234	132	0	3	6,304	2,471	3,446	269	70	51	1,481	818	479	99
(6)	Loughborough - -	2,607	30	0	4	1,883	732	1,100	15	17	23	356	236	94	16
(7)	Lutterworth - - -	396	7	0	0	233	124	95	3	6	5	55	18	17	2
(8)	Market Bosworth -	773	6	0	3	568	424	128	5	7	7	87	67	28	13
(9)	Market Harborough	514	11	0	1	279	146	115	6	3	10	43	27	20	1
(10)	Melton Mowbray -	737	12	0	1	431	251	163	12	2	4	145	99	54	7
(11)	Nuneaton - - -	692	13	0	3	438	261	164	7	6	3	200	114	54	10
(12)	Oakham - - -	475	2	0	1	233	160	112	2	8	2	179	111	82	3
(13)	Stamford - - -	1,054	15	0	0	603	416	162	9	14	2	109	50	18	6
(14)	Uppingham - - -	281	7	0	1	133	136	32	3	10	3	76	46	21	3
TOTALS - - -		22,860	303	0	23	15,044	7,438	6,894	406	181	153	3,778	2,350	1,330	211

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summonses in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
38	4	0	0	0	6	£. 1,008	£. 498	£. 30	£. 126	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
213	3	0	0	0	11	5,337	2,218	71	674	0	0	6	29	5	0	(2)
121	0	0	0	0	6	1,042	838	161	241	1	0	0	0	0	1 Interpleader, Bir- mingham Court.	(3)
19	0	0	0	0	6	572	347	4	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
181	3	0	0	0	11	3,723	1,655	101	459	3	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
436	0	0	0	0	11	7,319	2,654	101	906	5	21	4	19	4	0	(6)
112	5	0	0	0	11	2,085	1,252	155	294	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
75	4	0	0	0	11	1,208	579	53	168	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
313	6	0	0	1	22	6,198	2,536	127	744	3	0	4	40	10	20 & 21 Vict. c. 77. Application for Re- vocation of Probate.	(9)
89	3	1	0	0	11	1,850	765	58	228	2	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
48	0	0	0	0	6	989	554	13	114	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
88	2	0	0	0	11	1,913	992	42	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
120	5	0	0	0	11	3,146	1,381	55	368	1	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
103	0	0	0	0	11	1,541	774	62	241	1	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
986	35	1	0	1	145	38,531	17,043	1,033	4,884	19	21	14	88	19	2	
42	0	0	0	0	6	431	214	5	71	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
456	0	0	0	0	11	6,213	3,200	103	837	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
260	5	0	0	0	11	3,250	1,499	82	405	2	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
265	4	0	0	0	11	2,365	1,133	55	324	2	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
571	3	0	0	0	11	4,989	2,483	66	750	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
246	48	0	0	0	44	31,441	16,007	410	4,409	11	0	10	92	31	0	(6)
55	1	0	0	0	11	1,420	678	41	205	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
391	2	0	0	0	11	2,916	1,357	79	439	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
346	63	0	0	0	116	53,025	26,571	841	7,440	17	0	10	92	31	0	
667	17	0	0	0	12	6,852	4,430	176	1,059	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
76	1	0	0	0	11	1,526	593	50	185	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
58	0	0	0	0	11	1,688	733	65	203	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
686	5	0	0	0	11	5,527	2,969	60	909	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
874	20	1	0	0	13	5,976	4,025	58	1,143	0	0	6	15	3	0	(5)
73	2	0	0	0	11	1,802	556	26	219	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
364	25	0	0	0	21	10,729	6,275	165	1,685	1	0	2	23	2	0	(7)
535	33	0	0	0	32	13,026	8,302	101	2,022	0	0	5	36	8	0	(8)
127	6	0	0	0	11	2,057	1,129	32	266	0	0	0	0	0	1 Review of Taxation of Costs.	(9)
460	109	1	0	0	133	59,183	29,012	733	7,691	3	0	13	74	13	1	
722	8	0	0	0	12	5,313	3,511	75	876	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
150	1	0	0	0	12	2,113	1,046	71	288	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
601	3	0	0	0	12	5,122	2,734	92	785	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
97	1	0	0	0	6	1,367	631	14	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
939	37	0	0	0	24	27,131	13,733	358	3,534	4	0	12	54	18	0	(5)
693	18	0	0	0	12	5,848	3,414	127	877	2	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
78	0	0	0	0	6	1,126	548	11	153	2	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
190	0	0	0	0	6	1,665	1,038	30	289	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
115	4	0	0	0	6	1,776	886	19	231	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
154	3	0	0	0	12	2,185	1,181	47	303	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
194	2	0	1	0	12	1,842	989	36	266	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
113	0	0	0	0	6	1,035	591	16	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
219	3	0	0	0	12	2,147	1,542	147	385	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
99	2	0	0	0	6	863	503	46	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
5,364	82	0	1	0	144	59,533	32,347	1,089	8,493	8	0	12	54	18	0	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 23, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.	
CIRCUIT 21.																
(1)	Atherstone - -	441	9	0	0	280	182	88	7	1	2	28	22	8	0	
(2)	Birmingham - -	33,581	440	0	5	22,980	11,538	10,102	1,018	55	272	3,204	1,336	619	138	
(3)	Tamworth - -	651	17	0	0	379	198	165	4	1	11	27	12	4	1	
	TOTALS - - -	34,673	466	0	5	23,639	11,918	10,355	1,029	57	285	3,259	1,370	631	141	
CIRCUIT 22.																
(1)	Alcester - - -	525	2	0	1	286	181	93	3	2	8	93	53	22	2	
(2)	Bromsgrove - -	661	15	0	2	461	253	188	8	4	10	196	127	28	3	
(3)	Coventry - - -	1,914	41	0	5	1,092	623	404	27	15	28	517	360	261	40	
(4)	Daventry - - -	450	6	0	0	216	138	66	4	2	6	15	10	1	0	
(5)	Evesham - - -	644	8	0	0	369	224	137	2	1	5	48	22	11	1	
(6)	Kettering - - -	964	48	0	3	497	274	136	69	10	11	94	64	28	5	
(7)	Northampton - -	3,479	58	0	8	1,683	967	620	53	23	28	159	102	46	11	
(8)	Pershore - - -	405	3	0	1	231	143	81	1	2	5	37	19	13	2	
(9)	Redditch - - -	1,287	8	0	0	709	453	207	32	10	7	267	88	33	0	
(10)	Rugby - - -	1,004	22	1	1	574	398	157	5	7	8	84	40	24	5	
(11)	Solihull - - -	390	4	0	1	187	92	88	2	3	3	56	16	7	1	
(12)	Southam - - -	343	2	0	0	244	129	110	1	3	1	37	24	9	0	
(13)	Stratford-on-Avon -	468	12	0	0	263	163	84	10	2	4	32	17	4	2	
(14)	Towcester - - -	611	6	0	3	330	186	138	1	2	6	29	10	7	2	
(15)	Wellingborough - -	922	12	0	1	568	312	234	6	4	13	42	23	11	1	
	TOTALS - - -	14,067	247	1	26	7,710	4,536	2,743	224	90	143	1,706	975	505	75	
CIRCUIT 23.																
(1)	Bromyard - - -	252	10	0	0	128	93	27	0	3	5	28	12	4	1	
(2)	Droitwich - - -	404	9	0	0	239	166	62	8	2	1	108	51	24	0	
(3)	Dudley - - -	7,138	81	0	1	5,491	3,251	2,111	0	41	89	900	422	236	30	
(4)	Great Malvern - -	807	19	0	1	459	259	182	7	2	10	64	28	14	2	
(5)	Kidderminster - -	1,974	27	0	1	1,348	763	540	21	3	22	480	156	82	11	
(6)	Ledbury - - -	521	10	0	0	250	172	70	0	4	4	21	4	3	1	
(7)	Stourbridge - - -	4,796	38	0	0	3,393	1,892	1,414	52	13	22	725	303	165	15	
(8)	Tenbury - - -	346	13	0	0	194	105	74	4	0	11	74	21	10	3	
(9)	Worcester - - -	3,176	74	0	2	1,857	1,042	731	34	11	41	488	173	82	12	
	TOTALS - - -	19,414	281	0	5	13,359	7,743	5,211	126	79	205	2,888	1,170	620	75	

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
82	3	0	0	0	8	£. 1,323	£. 753	£. 28	£. 66	1	0	0	0	0	4 interpleaders.	(1)
5,150	303	1	0	0	154	107,652	58,905	3,148	14,347	14	0	31	402	47	0	(2)
86	3	0	0	0	8	2,113	999	65	233	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
5,318	309	1	0	0	170	111,088	60,657	3,241	14,646	15	0	31	402	47	4	
155	1	0	0	0	6	992	482	21	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
142	2	0	0	0	11	1,923	978	28	279	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
410	3	0	0	0	14	6,211	3,141	56	830	1	0	3	20	4	0	(3)
72	3	0	0	0	11	1,110	449	30	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
123	0	0	0	0	11	1,731	981	36	243	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
237	5	0	0	0	12	4,848	2,045	172	586	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
480	19	0	0	0	16	10,202	3,765	123	1,150	0	0	16	71	19	0	(7)
68	0	0	0	0	6	929	433	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
179	2	0	0	0	6	2,704	1,286	19	370	1	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
181	9	0	0	0	11	2,853	1,329	35	348	1	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
47	1	0	0	0	6	1,340	524	28	156	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
81	0	0	0	0	6	635	385	14	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
74	3	0	0	0	11	1,554	742	15	186	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
122	2	0	0	0	11	1,357	566	18	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
176	6	0	0	0	11	2,382	1,182	85	319	0	0	0	0	0	1 interpleader summons and hearing.	(15)
2,547	56	0	0	0	149	40,780	18,288	698	5,031	6	0	19	91	23	1	
21	0	0	0	0	6	923	320	5	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
42	0	0	0	0	6	1,246	726	17	165	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
1,835	36	0	9	0	41	16,557	10,395	503	2,499	2	0	0	35	16	0	(3)
179	2	0	0	0	12	2,370	1,309	68	308	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
721	8	0	0	0	12	4,986	2,714	267	747	2	0	1	14	1	0	(5)
54	0	0	0	0	6	1,415	477	32	162	2	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
1,262	7	0	0	0	28	9,902	5,409	288	1,558	2	0	1	29	5	0	(7)
143	0	0	0	0	6	1,419	644	44	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
667	10	0	0	1	24	10,344	5,576	225	1,320	3	0	6	52	9	0	(9)
4,924	63	0	9	1	141	49,162	27,570	1,449	7,038	12	0	2	130	31	0	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £ 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.	
CIRCUIT 24.																
(1)	Abergavenny - -	956	18	0	0	470	293	149	19	4	5	57	24	3	2	
(2)	Cardiff - - -	3,953	132	0	5	2,084	1,298	663	68	34	26	179	87	26	3	
(3)	Chepstow - - -	631	12	0	0	263	178	68	9	8	0	39	27	8	1	
(4)	Crickhowell - -	271	5	0	0	135	78	50	3	3	1	20	8	6	1	
(5)	Monmouth - - -	1,240	24	0	0	393	285	83	2	16	7	66	20	2	2	
(6)	Newport (Monmouth)	2,848	79	0	2	1,515	880	564	28	28	17	167	72	10	2	
(7)	Pontypool - - -	1,416	23	0	0	896	448	426	10	4	8	92	35	4	2	
(8)	Ross - - - - -	611	11	0	0	241	131	99	2	5	4	50	15	2	0	
(9)	Tredegar - - -	3,250	44	0	1	2,174	1,274	869	14	8	10	221	97	15	3	
(10)	Usk - - - - -	327	14	0	0	124	78	40	1	4	1	7	0	0	0	
	TOTALS - - -	15,503	362	0	8	8,295	4,943	3,011	156	114	79	898	385	76	16	
CIRCUIT 25.																
(1)	Oldbury - - -	6,635	71	0	1	4,935	2,484	2,372	43	25	12	812	437	218	12	
(2)	Walsall - - -	6,791	68	0	3	5,194	2,787	2,187	140	50	33	764	515	245	24	
(3)	Wolverhampton -	8,578	156	0	0	5,789	2,365	3,022	269	73	60	813	420	193	47	
	TOTALS - - -	22,004	295	0	4	15,918	7,636	7,581	452	148	105	2,389	1,372	656	83	
CIRCUIT 26.																
(1)	Cheadle - - - -	379	8	0	3	193	95	86	5	3	7	22	9	4	1	
(2)	Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall.	8,958	70	0	15	6,529	4,118	2,330	41	23	32	327	89	66	15	
(3)	Leek - - - - -	923	27	0	8	451	268	138	35	5	13	59	10	8	0	
(4)	Lichfield - - -	672	19	0	4	412	269	120	7	11	9	35	22	4	1	
(5)	Market Drayton -	293	3	0	3	144	88	42	7	6	4	9	1	1	0	
(6)	Newcastle-under-Lyme	3,302	31	0	3	2,427	1,442	936	10	24	18	222	83	45	5	
(7)	Rugeley - - - -	302	2	0	0	140	72	64	2	1	1	13	10	2	0	
(8)	Stafford - - - -	1,094	19	0	8	558	201	322	24	10	9	87	20	7	0	
(9)	Stoke-upon-Trent and Longton.	3,666	27	0	3	2,672	1,326	1,260	42	22	25	446	299	110	15	
(10)	Stone - - - - -	486	12	0	1	289	169	106	0	13	2	44	14	4	1	
(11)	Uttoxeter - - -	294	5	0	1	187	86	92	2	4	4	13	4	4	0	
	TOTALS - - -	20,369	223	0	49	14,002	8,134	5,496	175	122	124	1,277	561	255	38	
CIRCUIT 27.																
(1)	Bishop's Castle -	297	4	0	0	173	80	83	2	1	7	43	31	15	5	
(2)	Bridgnorth - - -	528	11	0	0	263	80	168	6	1	8	54	19	7	0	
(3)	Cleobury Mortimer -	342	5	0	0	169	67	93	2	0	7	22	11	5	0	
(4)	Hereford - - - -	2,010	42	0	3	1,010	555	333	98	1	26	218	101	71	15	
(5)	Leominster - - -	927	18	0	0	515	241	238	13	0	23	106	46	22	3	
(6)	Ludlow - - - - -	1,012	12	0	0	357	142	186	10	0	19	64	21	17	1	
(7)	Madeley - - - -	1,876	29	0	1	1,284	454	801	8	0	22	425	285	162	12	
(8)	Newport (Salop) -	753	12	0	2	391	101	276	3	0	13	61	17	11	7	
(9)	Oswestry - - - -	548	19	0	1	290	179	95	5	1	11	46	25	13	1	
(10)	Shrewsbury - - -	1,551	70	0	0	755	316	372	35	0	32	158	91	47	2	
(11)	Wellington (Salop) -	1,132	11	0	0	588	378	194	5	0	11	172	96	69	13	
(12)	Wem - - - - -	308	4	0	0	220	110	102	2	3	3	54	20	11	1	
	TOTALS - - -	11,284	237	0	7	6,015	2,703	2,941	189	7	182	1,423	763	450	60	

Executions against Goods.	Issued.	Sales made.	Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
								Amount of Debts (exclusively)	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
150	5	0	0	1	11	2,975	£. 1,063	£. 46	£. 361	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
849	23	0	1	2	33	13,964	5,986	146	1,930	5	48	9	39	17	0	0	(2)
110	4	0	0	0	11	2,043	758	55	243	2	0	0	0	0	0	3 acknowledgments	(3)
28	2	0	0	0	6	856	483	10	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
71	15	0	0	0	11	3,614	1,171	70	429	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
501	5	0	0	0	22	9,850	3,254	127	1,261	1	5	9	51	6	0	0	(6)
953	11	0	0	0	11	3,930	1,953	63	511	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
107	2	0	0	0	7	1,829	641	35	200	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
863	9	0	0	0	16	9,689	3,696	171	532	8	0	3	35	1	0	0	(9)
23	0	0	0	1	6	1,371	185	10	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
055	76	0	1	4	134	50,121	19,190	733	5,692	21	53	21	125	24	3	0	
953	24	0	0	0	38	13,438	8,711	485	2,111	9	0	1	31	15	0	0	(1)
555	67	0	0	0	40	18,089	11,565	492	2,699	3	0	6	59	4	0	0	(2)
056	52	0	0	4	66	26,497	14,996	649	3,535	3	0	4	72	8	1 replevin; 7 interpleaders.	0	(3)
564	143	0	0	4	144	58,024	35,272	1,626	8,345	15	0	11	162	27	8	0	
86	5	0	0	0	11	1,112	500	26	149	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
16	58	0	0	0	34	20,380	1,3260	334	3,253	7	0	10	87	19	0	0	(2)
188	0	0	0	0	11	3,422	1,110	37	394	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
153	0	0	0	0	11	2,554	1,065	55	323	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
43	3	0	0	0	6	759	382	5	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
033	15	0	0	0	12	7,432	4,601	142	1,142	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
43	0	0	0	0	6	919	317	2	104	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
253	5	0	0	0	11	4,020	1,929	36	482	0	0	5	20	7	0	0	(8)
437	61	0	0	0	22	9,619	5,545	214	1,461	0	0	4	37	2	0	0	(9)
88	2	0	0	0	6	1,586	797	45	189	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
47	0	0	0	0	6	1,380	482	13	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
387	149	0	0	0	136	53,183	29,988	909	7,752	13	0	19	144	28	0	0	
81	1	0	0	0	6	921	464	30	130	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
118	0	0	0	0	6	1,600	664	15	189	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
58	2	0	0	0	7	996	471	74	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
402	15	0	0	0	36	7,024	3,326	133	657	1	0	3	21	3	0	0	(4)
173	5	0	0	0	24	2,457	1,182	33	324	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	(5)
142	2	0	0	0	12	2,593	937	94	285	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
679	7	0	0	0	19	4,716	3,014	108	741	1	0	2	30	3	0	0	(7)
125	5	0	0	0	6	2,203	1,000	38	252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
68	5	0	0	0	12	2,167	1,061	47	242	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
205	1	0	0	0	25	7,052	2,740	147	731	1	0	3	18	2	1 interpleader	0	(10)
340	0	0	0	0	13	2,858	1,399	80	397	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
59	0	0	0	0	6	951	325	20	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
2,450	43	0	0	0	172	35,538	16,583	824	4,207	7	0	8	78	8	1	0	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20. and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
CIRCUIT 28.															
(1)	Aberystwith - -	1,156	52	0	8	540	310	196	18	8	16	50	26	11	0
(2)	Bala - - -	136	0	0	0	40	20	13	4	1	2	2	1	1	
(3)	Builth - - -	122	3	0	1	33	26	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	1
(4)	Corwen - - -	219	3	0	0	99	66	23	0	3	7	4	2	1	0
(5)	Dolgelly - - -	242	2	0	1	127	89	26	7	3	3	69	38	6	1
(6)	Hay - - -	411	6	0	0	177	104	62	1	8	2	59	22	3	0
(7)	Kington - - -	200	1	0	0	97	58	32	0	1	6	11	8	1	0
(8)	Knighton - - -	476	5	0	1	200	104	86	7	2	2	21	14	6	1
(9)	Llanfyllin - - -	230	9	0	0	102	58	38	2	1	3	21	9	5	0
(10)	Llanidloes - - -	222	3	1	1	84	69	10	2	1	3	25	7	3	0
(11)	Machynlleth - - -	292	19	0	1	127	80	34	7	3	4	40	15	11	1
(12)	Newtown - - -	462	3	0	3	217	152	54	6	2	6	35	21	9	1
(13)	Portmadoc - - -	705	16	0	1	343	242	80	6	7	9	47	22	6	2
(14)	Presteigne - - -	122	2	0	0	49	30	18	0	1	0	18	5	4	0
(15)	Pwllheli - - -	350	11	0	0	157	93	48	0	8	8	18	9	5	0
(16)	Rhayader - - -	104	3	0	1	40	28	5	1	5	2	9	2	2	0
(17)	Welchpool - - -	802	18	0	0	370	236	116	6	4	8	100	55	21	
	TOTALS - - -	6,251	156	1	18	2,802	1,765	844	69	59	83	530	257	97	9
CIRCUIT 29.															
(1)	Bangor - - -	1,003	13	0	1	508	326	166	6	7	4	214	121	81	4
(2)	Carnarvon - - -	1,952	43	0	2	1,056	806	209	9	20	14	332	186	100	7
(3)	Chester - - -	2,668	65	0	2	1,368	853	409	46	30	32	351	146	90	13
(4)	Conway - - -	290	9	0	0	104	59	37	4	3	1	11	7	2	0
(5)	Denbigh - - -	468	8	0	1	174	96	67	1	2	9	76	28	11	1
(6)	Holywell - - -	533	19	0	1	551	486	52	1	4	9	62	27	6	0
(7)	Llangefni and Holyhead	779	32	0	11	273	202	49	8	15	10	41	26	12	1
(8)	Llanrwst - - -	308	2	0	0	108	61	38	3	2	4	20	8	2	0
(9)	Mold and Flint - -	1,051	15	0	0	512	283	213	1	11	4	76	56	27	8
(10)	Ruthin - - -	413	7	0	1	160	108	39	9	2	3	55	11	4	0
(11)	St. Asaph and Rhyl -	583	12	0	0	217	140	48	12	5	12	34	19	4	0
(12)	Wrexham and Llangollen.	2,446	64	1	0	1,143	685	419	10	13	16	245	109	31	12
	TOTALS - - -	12,494	289	1	19	6,174	4,105	1,746	110	114	118	1,526	744	370	46
CIRCUIT 30.															
(1)	Aberdare - - -	3,049	37	1	4	2,285	1,270	989	9	6	15	271	196	110	9
(2)	Brecknock - - -	631	26	0	0	224	182	31	0	5	6	41	38	10	0
(3)	Bridgend and Cowbridge	1,239	41	0	1	643	476	139	7	8	14	52	17	17	3
(4)	Merthyr-Tydfil - -	3,430	53	0	6	2,306	1,509	777	6	2	18	492	341	192	32
(5)	Pontypridd - - -	2,969	38	0	2	1,973	1,468	462	22	5	18	300	168	105	23
(6)	Swansea - - -	5,130	168	0	7	3,150	2,407	590	54	50	56	845	627	385	31
	TOTALS - - -	16,448	363	1	20	10,581	7,312	2,988	98	76	127	2,001	1,387	819	98

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors Summoned in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
216	14	0	0	0	15	£. 6,039	£. 2,872	£. 168	£. 686	4	0	3	24	3	0	(1)
9	0	0	0	0	5	356	137	5	51	1	0	0	0	0	1 interpleader claim; judgment for claim- ant; costs allowed 10%.	(2)
22	2	0	0	0	6	600	280	21	71	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
40	2	0	0	0	5	703	278	23	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
45	2	0	0	0	5	884	446	41	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
23	2	0	0	0	6	1,221	483	9	148	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
12	0	0	0	0	6	662	269	8	82	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
77	1	0	0	0	6	1,304	622	33	169	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
13	0	0	0	0	6	938	351	52	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
14	0	0	0	0	6	706	232	12	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
33	2	0	0	0	6	1,751	541	54	176	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
78	2	0	0	0	6	1,263	543	20	165	0	0	2	12	1	0	(12)
138	7	0	0	0	8	2,359	1,032	25	320	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
25	1	0	0	0	6	259	103	2	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
42	0	0	0	0	5	1,393	513	27	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	(15)
9	1	0	0	0	6	457	146	6	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	(16)
162	8	0	0	0	11	2,687	1,111	30	314	2	0	0	0	0	0	(17)
958	44	0	0	0	114	23,582	9,959	536	2,796	11	0	5	36	4	1	
239	0	0	0	0	11	2,975	1,307	75	403	6	3	5	56	4	2 writs of <i>hæri facias</i> from Lord Mayor's Court; 2 garnishee summonses.	(1)
625	1	0	0	0	11	6,186	3,227	135	914	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
548	14	0	0	0	14	9,046	4,292	316	1,191	6	0	2	31	10	0	(3)
23	0	0	0	0	6	1,315	528	45	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
52	0	0	0	0	6	1,610	573	13	177	2	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
62	1	0	0	0	11	2,323	844	50	252	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
82	4	0	0	0	11	3,240	1,083	240	382	6	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
25	0	0	0	0	5	834	279	56	102	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
92	2	0	0	0	11	3,146	1,727	116	416	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
49	0	0	0	0	5	1,830	504	26	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
98	1	0	0	0	11	1,876	604	47	215	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
231	9	0	0	0	16	8,642	3,944	142	979	2	0	4	28	9	0	(12)
121	23	0	0	0	118	43,023	18,912	1,261	5,307	23	3	11	115	23	4	
173	20	1	0	0	20	9,307	6,374	81	1,342	1	0	2	12	0	0	(1)
61	2	0	0	0	11	2,538	885	83	257	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
209	2	0	0	0	13	4,764	1,807	100	542	3	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
192	9	0	0	0	29	9,364	5,701	905	1,393	2	0	4	15	5	6 interpleaders 1 replevin.	(4)
750	7	1	0	0	15	9,824	6,100	97	1,440	4	0	3	21	3	0	(5)
285	14	0	0	0	50	20,338	8,684	542	2,626	4	21	4	54	7	5 administrations.	(6)
670	54	2	0	0	138	56,135	29,551	1,808	7,600	15	21	13	102	15	12	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.	
CIRCUIT 31.																
(1)	Aberayron - -	252	13	0	1	72	66	3	1	2	1	4	2	0	0	
(2)	Cardigan - -	303	7	0	0	84	40	38	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	
(3)	Carmarthen - -	781	25	0	1	230	166	53	7	4	1	37	10	16	3	
(4)	Haverfordwest -	712	35	0	0	240	161	56	14	5	4	9	3	3	0	
(5)	Lampeter - -	548	12	0	1	95	72	16	0	5	1	9	5	4	1	
(6)	Llandilofawr - -	418	19	0	2	148	80	59	3	4	4	25	7	6	0	
(7)	Llandovery - -	314	16	0	0	98	64	29	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	
(8)	Llanelly - -	1,064	40	0	0	515	373	111	19	5	7	35	15	10	1	
(9)	Narberth - -	723	10	0	0	160	62	92	3	1	2	12	5	4	0	
(10)	Neath - -	2,901	44	1	0	1,825	1,417	369	13	11	15	183	89	57	5	
(11)	Newcastle-in-Emlyn	266	5	0	2	65	31	28	5	0	3	7	3	0	0	
(12)	Pembroke Dock -	659	20	0	0	239	152	72	9	2	4	29	7	4	1	
TOTALS - - -		8,941	246	1	7	3,771	2,684	928	78	44	44	352	147	104	11	
CIRCUIT 32.																
(1)	Attleborough - -	239	3	0	2	84	61	17	3	2	3	6	3	1	0	
(2)	Aylsham - -	246	3	0	0	105	71	23	2	4	5	11	5	1	1	
(3)	Downham Market -	271	4	0	1	135	70	49	1	4	12	1	0	0	0	
(4)	East Dereham - -	391	7	0	1	149	108	25	5	5	7	19	7	3	0	
(5)	Ely - -	667	16	0	0	297	208	72	2	6	9	8	4	0	0	
(6)	Holt - -	170	3	0	0	67	44	14	1	0	8	9	3	0	0	
(7)	King's Lynn - -	1,139	43	0	4	567	284	249	16	10	12	56	23	7	0	
(8)	Little Walsingham -	449	6	0	1	199	131	53	5	1	10	12	4	3	1	
(9)	North Walsham - -	234	3	0	0	87	51	27	0	3	6	9	2	1	0	
(10)	Norwich - -	3,118	61	0	2	1,269	738	368	124	25	16	226	71	37	8	
(11)	Soham - -	137	3	0	0	86	55	28	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	
(12)	Swaffham - -	231	2	0	0	107	75	22	0	6	4	0	0	0	0	
(13)	Thetford - -	271	3	0	1	98	64	29	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	
(14)	Wymondham - -	140	7	0	0	55	37	14	0	1	3	5	3	0	0	
TOTALS - - -		7,703	164	0	12	3,305	1,997	990	161	68	101	366	125	54	10	
CIRCUIT 33.																
(1)	Beccles and Bungay	482	6	0	0	210	141	54	2	2	11	57	28	10	1	
(2)	Bury St. Edmunds -	1,414	31	0	0	523	435	53	17	5	13	129	41	13	1	
(3)	Diss and Eye - -	456	14	0	1	183	138	31	2	6	7	11	5	4	3	
(4)	Framlingham and Saxmundham.	420	11	0	2	204	161	31	3	5	6	73	30	10	5	
(5)	Great Yarmouth - -	2,042	47	0	2	1,025	650	334	14	7	22	172	58	25	4	
(6)	Halesworth - -	397	12	0	1	170	107	49	3	4	8	23	9	6	0	
(7)	Harleston - -	390	6	0	0	162	120	35	1	1	5	43	19	11	1	
(8)	Ipswich - -	3,164	61	0	0	1,768	1,196	496	26	21	29	507	230	76	13	
(9)	Lowestoft - -	799	16	0	0	297	180	91	12	7	7	67	23	5	3	
(10)	Mildenhall - -	227	3	0	0	99	69	24	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	
(11)	Stowmarket - -	648	22	0	0	281	166	83	17	6	9	62	34	21	1	
(12)	Woodbridge - -	348	10	0	0	148	99	36	0	2	11	53	19	5	1	
TOTALS - - -		10,787	239	0	6	5,070	3,462	1,317	99	68	130	1,201	498	187	34	

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
18	0	0	0	0	6	£. 1,208	£. 256	£. 77	£. 115	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
24	0	0	0	0	6	1,106	360	37	109	0	0	0	0	0	3 interpleader summonses.	(2)
87	6	0	0	0	11	3,217	940	102	343	1	2	10	69	4	0	(3)
75	6	0	0	0	11	3,531	1,285	163	362	0	0	0	0	0	1 summons in the na- ture of a <i>scire facias</i> , and 3 interpleaders.	(4)
29	0	0	0	0	6	1,939	421	98	200	2	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
50	0	0	0	0	6	1,786	585	52	187	3	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
17	1	0	0	0	6	1,480	473	59	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
207	3	0	0	0	11	4,752	1,771	163	496	5	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
56	1	0	0	0	11	1,752	637	60	186	2	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
979	7	0	0	0	15	8,038	4,449	84	1,146	3	0	2	17	3	0	(10)
49	0	0	0	0	6	879	95	28	100	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
137	6	0	0	0	11	2,201	973	101	248	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
728	30	0	0	0	106	31,889	12,245	1,024	3,647	18	2	12	86	7	7	
22	2	0	0	0	6	872	291	8	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
26	0	0	0	0	11	644	280	44	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
38	2	0	0	0	6	856	307	43	96	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
54	0	0	0	0	10	1,155	463	12	141	1	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
84	1	0	0	0	6	2,184	613	27	243	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
21	0	0	0	0	6	451	133	16	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
292	0	0	0	0	12	4,098	1,321	89	439	1	6	3	17	4	0	(7)
70	1	0	0	0	10	1,170	424	40	149	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
31	3	0	0	0	7	754	302	75	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
514	8	0	7	0	24	14,103	4,029	520	1,216	7	0	13	74	5	0	(10)
26	0	0	0	0	6	444	219	16	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
24	15	0	0	0	6	481	236	38	71	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
45	0	0	0	0	6	766	148	20	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
10	1	0	0	0	6	693	217	12	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
257	33	0	7	0	122	28,671	8,983	960	2,906	13	6	16	91	9	0	
57	1	0	0	0	11	1,333	514	28	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
137	1	0	0	0	17	4,480	1,565	93	498	0	0	3	21	3	0	(2)
48	1	0	0	0	11	1,716	553	53	187	0	0	0	0	0	1 interpleader summons issued but not heard.	(3)
28	0	0	0	0	12	1,510	576	114	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
432	23	0	0	0	33	6,758	3,324	314	982	3	39	12	41	4	0	(5)
49	4	0	0	0	11	1,559	563	87	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
72	1	0	0	0	8	1,099	423	42	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
578	1	0	0	0	35	8,545	3,563	281	1,155	7	7	2	51	7	0	(8)
124	0	0	0	0	15	3,291	1,257	47	369	0	15	0	0	0	0	(9)
24	1	0	0	0	6	664	221	19	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
122	5	0	0	0	12	2,250	796	63	254	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
26	0	0	0	0	11	1,083	382	51	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
697	38	0	0	0	182	34,288	13,737	1,192	4,320	11	61	17	113	14	1	

20 RETURNS FROM COUNTY COURTS, OF PLAINTS ENTERED; CAUSES TRIED; SITTINGS

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 23, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 103, or sect. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.	
CIRCUIT 35.																
(1)	Ampthill - - -	561	6	0	2	333	207	119	1	3	5	44	22	12	2	
(2)	Bedford - - -	1,448	20	0	2	635	322	280	17	6	12	120	51	18	2	
(3)	Biggleswade - -	686	14	0	1	372	298	60	2	3	10	81	23	6	1	
(4)	Bishop's Stortford -	647	18	0	0	275	196	73	2	1	3	78	41	13	2	
(5)	Cambridge - - -	2,309	49	0	4	988	724	202	7	34	25	154	51	17	2	
(6)	Haverhill - - -	407	5	0	0	169	101	60	2	1	5	20	9	3	0	
(7)	Huntingdon - - -	1,192	16	0	4	654	422	200	8	8	20	55	21	7	3	
(8)	March - - -	473	4	0	0	264	159	91	2	5	7	14	9	3	0	
(9)	Newmarket - - -	388	9	0	0	211	135	66	4	2	4	12	4	2	0	
(10)	Oundle - - -	655	4	0	0	399	265	121	0	2	11	49	25	7	1	
(11)	Peterborough - -	2,021	31	0	2	1,078	664	369	18	1	28	115	61	30	6	
(12)	Royston - - -	556	6	0	0	269	179	81	0	7	2	87	53	13	3	
(13)	Saffron Walden -	401	4	0	0	158	114	33	0	9	2	3	0	0	0	
(14)	St. Neots - - -	413	11	0	1	175	108	57	1	6	4	7	5	1	1	
(15)	Thrapston - - -	536	8	0	2	321	237	71	7	4	4	25	18	2	2	
(16)	Wisbech - - -	967	15	2	5	478	308	154	5	5	11	28	12	2	1	
TOTALS - - -		13,660	220	2	23	6,779	4,439	2,037	76	97	153	892	405	136	26	
CIRCUIT 36.																
(1)	Abingdon - - -	611	2	0	0	328	196	123	2	1	6	23	12	7	2	
(2)	Banbury - - -	1,149	19	0	1	569	393	142	20	5	10	53	19	7	2	
(3)	Bicester - - -	463	9	0	0	281	109	165	3	0	4	66	23	18	2	
(4)	Brackley - - -	391	4	0	0	146	106	31	4	1	4	9	7	1	0	
(5)	Buckingham - - -	655	14	0	0	323	150	166	0	0	7	43	23	10	2	
(6)	Chipping Norton -	307	3	0	0	148	112	30	5	0	1	5	3	1	0	
(7)	Faringdon - - -	298	12	0	0	160	75	75	4	5	1	17	7	4	0	
(8)	Oxford - - -	1,755	56	0	0	888	608	245	19	8	8	230	122	55	8	
(9)	Shipston-on-Stour -	628	8	0	1	338	227	88	3	13	8	45	24	17	2	
(10)	Stow-on-the-Wold -	259	2	0	0	152	87	59	3	2	1	8	4	3	2	
(11)	Thame - - -	455	6	0	0	242	139	91	3	3	6	48	31	8	0	
(12)	Wantage - - -	309	12	0	0	181	124	51	2	2	2	6	4	2	0	
(13)	Warwick - - -	2,077	24	0	2	1,088	698	368	15	3	6	188	72	54	3	
(14)	Witney - - -	458	11	0	1	223	156	61	0	4	3	32	18	8	1	
(15)	Woodstock - - -	337	1	0	0	234	142	88	1	1	2	17	11	6	0	
TOTALS - - -		10,152	183	0	5	5,301	3,322	1,783	84	48	69	790	380	201	24	

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summonses in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively)	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
						£.	£.	£.	£.							
88	0	1	0	0	11	1,027	579	53	157	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
305	3	0	0	0	12	4,073	1,500	60	501	1	0	4	32	1	0	(2)
167	0	0	0	0	11	1,859	752	25	242	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
74	4	0	0	0	7	2,591	786	21	267	2	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
254	3	0	0	0	13	7,716	2,511	164	858	1	0	9	27	7	1 interpleader.	(5)
92	5	0	0	0	6	996	309	7	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
231	16	1	0	0	11	3,255	1,521	56	419	1	0	0	0	0	2 writs of execution reissued under "The Borough and Local Courts of Record Act, 1872."	(7)
94	0	0	0	0	11	1,305	590	23	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
60	0	0	0	0	7	1,338	377	28	163	1	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
135	1	0	0	0	11	1,326	663	29	189	0	0	0	0	0	1 application under 36 & 37 Vict. c. 52.	(10)
330	3	0	0	0	11	4,954	3,319	115	664	1	0	5	46	8	0	(11)
37	2	0	0	0	6	1,502	668	10	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
57	4	0	0	0	6	921	278	12	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
107	5	0	0	0	6	1,151	416	49	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
101	5	0	0	1	11	1,399	444	65	173	1	0	0	0	0	0	(15)
228	2	0	0	0	11	3,154	1,111	78	371	0	0	0	0	0	0	(16)
420	53	2	0	1	151	38,567	15,824	795	4,742	10	0	18	105	16	4	
141	0	0	0	0	11	1,237	608	10	177	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
166	1	0	0	0	11	3,501	1,657	62	413	0	0	5	24	2	0	(2)
93	3	0	0	0	10	1,306	648	17	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
43	1	0	0	0	10	865	320	19	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
115	5	0	0	0	11	2,201	870	17	243	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
36	1	0	0	0	6	1,043	482	30	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
41	0	0	0	0	6	1,156	436	6	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
237	8	0	0	1	12	9,146	3,349	109	953	1	0	5	37	11	0	(8)
109	1	0	0	0	11	1,570	749	33	205	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
65	4	0	0	0	6	746	455	24	118	1	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
44	1	0	0	0	10	1,263	502	14	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
74	6	1	0	0	6	1,197	658	7	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
470	5	0	0	0	12	7,230	1,900	56	888	5	0	1	31	6	0	(13)
87	1	0	0	0	6	1,619	476	26	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
121	0	0	0	0	6	666	441	9	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	(15)
1,842	37	1	0	1	134	34,746	13,551	439	4,082	7	0	11	92	19	0	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.	
CIRCUIT 37.																
(1)	Aylesbury - -	832	15	0	1	369	275	72	4	3	16	73	45	17	4	
(2)	Barnet - - -	753	11	0	2	359	220	120	5	4	12	73	34	16	7	
(3)	Chesham - - -	550	12	0	1	211	142	56	0	3	11	87	42	12	5	
(4)	Henley-on-Thames -	269	2	0	1	128	81	43	0	2	3	32	17	10	3	
(5)	High Wycombe -	939	16	0	2	407	280	96	15	2	16	50	31	12	3	
(6)	Leighton Buzzard -	1,144	20	0	1	446	334	82	11	7	13	134	61	38	3	
(7)	Luton - - -	1,458	20	0	5	734	430	277	15	1	16	211	126	62	12	
(8)	Newport Pagnell -	961	15	0	5	523	411	96	3	4	14	166	101	50	6	
(9)	Saint Albans - -	1,151	22	0	1	548	386	142	11	1	9	248	136	42	5	
(10)	Uxbridge - - -	1,124	32	0	0	593	398	168	5	2	20	257	154	117	18	
(11)	Wallingford - - -	432	5	0	0	250	130	112	1	2	5	40	25	10	1	
(12)	Watford - - -	879	28	0	2	485	346	114	6	8	13	120	75	34	4	
(13)	Windsor - - -	1,868	58	0	9	894	692	172	10	4	25	150	48	21	1	
	TOTALS - - -	12,360	256	0	30	5,947	4,125	1,550	86	43	173	1,641	895	441	72	
CIRCUIT 38.																
(1)	Braintree - - -	627	5	0	0	235	156	71	3	4	1	71	37	27	4	
(2)	Brentwood - - -	509	6	0	0	234	162	61	2	8	1	76	31	10	1	
(3)	Chelmsford - - -	727	8	0	0	313	194	104	6	7	2	44	23	9	0	
(4)	Colchester - - -	1,642	47	0	1	769	502	221	18	20	9	85	40	30	10	
(5)	Dunmow - - -	294	5	0	0	153	105	45	1	1	1	22	8	1	0	
(6)	Edmonton - - -	1,589	15	0	2	810	494	266	16	21	15	147	103	63	14	
(7)	Hadleigh - - -	415	2	0	0	233	108	160	3	4	8	38	15	6	0	
(8)	Halstead - - -	374	4	0	1	113	88	21	2	2	1	36	12	4	2	
(9)	Harwich - - -	506	5	0	0	246	177	51	1	13	4	34	13	7	3	
(10)	Hertford - - -	739	14	0	1	438	237	191	1	4	6	109	63	34	13	
(11)	Hitchin - - -	590	13	0	1	326	199	109	3	10	6	94	43	23	6	
(12)	Maldon - - -	523	9	0	2	233	188	39	0	4	4	58	28	12	2	
(13)	Rochford - - -	565	7	0	1	255	185	60	3	3	5	44	26	13	3	
(14)	Romford - - -	1,008	3	0	2	566	377	163	8	9	11	70	42	21	2	
(15)	Sudbury - - -	597	10	0	0	239	154	75	1	4	5	53	19	8	3	
(16)	Waltham Abbey -	1,041	7	0	0	530	283	228	3	8	8	87	50	28	6	
	TOTALS - - -	11,746	160	0	11	5,743	3,609	1,865	71	122	87	1,068	553	296	60	
CIRCUIT 39.																
(1)	Whitechapel - -	9,297	94	0	15	5,885	2,920	2,370	239	197	174	1,106	410	192	32	

Issued.	Sales made.	Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceedings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Proceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composition Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
							Amount of Debts (exclusively)	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
93	3	0	0	0	12	£. 2,512	£. 1,018	£. 65	£. 298	0	0	1	21	0	Letters of Administration were obtained through this County Court, in one case, under the provisions of 36 & 37 Vict. c. 52.	(1)
19	1	0	0	0	12	2,794	1,284	64	364	0	0	0	6	4	0	(2)
40	0	0	0	0	12	1,539	429	22	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
46	1	0	0	0	6	646	108	7	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
127	1	0	0	0	13	3,604	1,411	75	416	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
142	7	0	0	0	12	3,043	1,214	47	364	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
146	0	0	0	2	13	4,424	1,877	96	537	0	0	0	32	4	0	(7)
207	2	0	0	0	12	2,628	1,061	97	342	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
97	1	0	0	0	12	3,384	1,521	110	420	0	0	5	20	6	0	(9)
143	5	0	0	0	12	3,755	1,841	90	484	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
90	0	0	0	0	6	1,053	648	36	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
108	2	0	0	0	12	3,295	1,738	143	436	3	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
195	5	0	0	0	12	7,737	2,645	186	794	2	0	8	32	13	0	(13)
553	28	0	0	2	146	40,414	16,790	1,038	4,853	6	0	14	111	27	1	
84	1	0	0	0	6	1,317	485	27	166	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
59	0	0	0	0	6	1,331	621	23	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
39	0	0	0	0	12	2,291	815	29	245	1	0	4	38	4	0	(3)
267	7	0	0	0	12	6,448	2,417	147	684	1	2	3	35	3	0	(4)
85	0	0	0	0	5	866	433	24	118	0	0	0	0	0	1 Interpleader heard.	(5)
222	5	0	0	0	31	4,659	2,273	141	624	3	0	8	26	17	1 Writ or Precept under c. 86, 35 & 36 Vict. s. 6.	(6)
68	2	0	0	0	6	905	531	21	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
39	0	0	0	0	6	983	328	9	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
96	0	0	0	0	6	1,132	501	20	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
101	0	0	0	0	13	2,177	1,019	42	265	3	0	3	9	3	0	(10)
18	1	0	0	0	7	1,924	810	49	236	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
97	0	0	0	0	7	1,747	756	69	213	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
97	1	0	0	0	6	1,637	777	37	210	0	0	0	0	0	1 Set of Papers filled up and transmitted under 36 & 37 Vict. c. 52.	(13)
77	1	0	0	0	12	2,320	1,224	54	329	1	0	0	0	0	1 Interpleader.	(14)
56	0	0	0	0	11	1,624	806	23	178	0	0	0	0	0	0	(15)
70	6	0	0	0	12	2,558	1,223	54	331	1	0	0	0	0	0	(16)
75	24	0	0	0	158	33,919	15,019	769	4,153	12	2	18	108	27	4	
110	9	0	2	0	116	27,105	13,619	597	3,587	2	0	0	0	0	4 1 Replevin; 3 Interpleader.	(1)

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £.20.	Above £.20 and not exceeding £.50.	By Agreement above £.50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.	
(1)	CIRCUIT 40.															
	Bow - - -	7,836	77	0	18	5,165	2,432	2,351	94	149	157	815	297	111	37	
	Shoreditch - -	10,010	88	0	21	5,760	2,648	2,505	275	123	230	1,006	407	189	18	
	TOTALS - - -	17,846	165	0	39	10,925	5,080	4,856	369	272	387	1,821	704	300	55	
(1)	CIRCUIT 41.															
	Clerkenwell - -	13,501	152	0	9	7,510	3,385	3,459	209	176	290	1,715	610	218	60	
(1)	CIRCUIT 42.															
	Bloomsbury - -	10,550	183	1	14	5,873	2,897	2,329	212	152	297	1,506	668	239	31	
(1)	CIRCUIT 43.															
	Brentford - - -	2,119	42	0	4	1,154	886	243	1	37	41	450	175	111	14	
	Brompton - - -	6,470	115	0	10	3,759	2,263	1,276	52	59	119	1,274	543	284	71	
(3)	Marylebone - -	7,565	119	0	13	4,408	2,388	1,667	30	81	255	1,551	600	310	57	
	TOTALS - - -	16,154	276	0	27	9,321	5,487	3,186	83	177	415	3,275	1,318	705	142	
(1)	CIRCUIT 44.															
	Westminster - -	12,043	272	0	14	6,145	3,741	1,884	198	80	256	1,980	726	297	55	
(1)	CIRCUIT 45.															
	Chertsey - - -	968	14	0	3	550	391	132	8	9	13	223	106	49	6	
	Croydon - - -	2,340	52	0	4	1,318	946	312	23	16	25	351	154	57	10	
(3)	Epsom - - -	724	17	0	0	393	253	123	5	5	7	79	40	18	3	
(4)	Farnham and Aldershot.	977	37	0	4	386	302	58	12	6	12	100	42	21	6	
(5)	Guildford and Godalming.	904	13	0	0	505	276	190	26	5	8	138	76	58	5	
(6)	Hungerford - - -	291	3	0	0	153	66	83	1	2	1	30	21	3	2	
(7)	Kingston-on-Thames	1,716	39	0	3	887	631	218	10	11	20	418	175	72	15	
(8)	Newbury - - -	788	16	0	0	436	267	152	3	6	8	83	55	17	7	
(9)	Reading - - -	1,988	39	0	1	912	550	298	35	19	11	145	75	29	5	
(10)	Wandsworth - - -	4,023	41	0	8	2,355	1,399	828	41	40	55	616	272	125	14	
	TOTALS - - -	14,719	271	0	23	7,895	5,081	2,394	164	119	160	2,183	1,016	449	73	
(1)	CIRCUIT 46.															
	Southwark - - -	12,594	118	0	10	7,207	3,463	3,107	385	88	174	996	416	181	39	

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively)	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
881	27	1	0	0	62	£. 21,504	£. 10,827	£. 625	£. 2,887	4	0	0	0	0	12 precepts, &c., sent for execution, under 35 & 36 Vict. c. 86, s. 6.	(1)
219	57	1	0	1	91	33,219	16,452	914	4,246	7	0	0	0	0	2 replevins, 33 in- terpleaders.	(2)
050	84	2	0	1	153	54,723	27,279	1,539	7,133	11	0	0	0	0	47	
306	41	0	0	0	152	45,448	24,368	1,492	6,157	11	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
918	19	1	0	0	160	44,677	23,090	803	5,852	8	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
409	3	0	0	0	21	6,276	3,617	984	1,129	5	0	6	26	18	0	(1)
916	5	0	0	0	57	24,873	12,540	807	3,425	11	0	0	0	0	4 replevins	(2)
238	4	0	0	3	72	30,403	16,254	1,477	4,304	7	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
563	12	0	0	3	150	61,552	32,411	3,268	8,858	23	0	6	26	18	4	
127	26	0	0	0	125	61,649	27,909	899	7,851	16	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
92	0	0	0	0	11	3,379	1,844	179	434	3	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
291	4	1	0	0	21	9,722	4,992	263	1,259	3	0	9	72	34	0	(2)
105	3	0	0	0	6	2,815	1,256	135	349	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
94	5	0	1	0	11	4,477	2,000	108	507	4	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
101	4	1	1	0	12	2,981	1,381	81	401	2	0	1	29	7	0	(5)
34	2	0	0	0	5	931	455	15	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
251	0	0	0	0	12	6,755	3,194	436	865	2	0	7	38	27	0	(7)
160	2	0	0	1	11	3,072	1,465	56	371	2	0	1	10	0	0	(8)
294	15	1	0	1	11	6,753	2,978	147	796	0	0	5	23	5	0	(9)
771	10	0	0	2	34	11,996	5,888	515	1,816	4	0	14	55	44	0	(10)
193	45	3	2	4	134	52,881	25,453	1,935	6,907	21	0	37	227	117	0	
686	14	0	0	0	129	43,895	21,331	951	5,630	2	0	0	0	0	96 2 acknowledgments by married women; 6 interpleader sum- mons; 74 special applications for new trials, &c.; 14 new trials.	(1)

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or sect. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
	CIRCUIT 47.														
(1)	Greenwich - -	3,686	49	0	2	2,210	1,038	940	40	97	97	456	239	116	42
(2)	Lambeth - -	7,968	102	0	13	5,175	2,334	2,392	75	164	223	1,078	531	250	53
(3)	Woolwich - -	1,981	20	0	6	1,216	511	619	23	35	34	288	182	79	30
	TOTALS - - -	13,635	171	0	21	8,601	3,883	3,951	138	296	354	1,822	952	445	125
	CIRCUIT 48.														
(1)	Bromley - -	584	8	0	0	302	161	118	3	8	12	95	35	2	0
(2)	Dartford - -	969	19	0	2	422	292	98	4	22	8	256	110	43	7
(3)	Gravesend - -	2,335	28	0	1	1,213	651	532	12	13	6	533	243	111	18
(4)	Maidstone - -	2,052	42	0	3	1,131	806	274	20	26	8	313	166	86	14
(5)	Rochester - -	4,943	35	0	4	3,021	1,834	1,114	19	41	17	1,959	1,014	603	79
(6)	Sevenoaks - -	355	5	0	0	165	130	26	2	7	0	10	4	1	0
(7)	Sheerness - -	932	11	0	1	501	318	164	4	6	10	299	190	127	6
(8)	Tonbridge - -	388	13	0	1	195	134	51	2	7	2	28	11	4	2
(9)	Tonbridge Wells -	1,219	52	0	3	545	346	156	9	20	17	42	12	6	2
	TOTALS - - -	13,777	213	0	15	7,495	4,672	2,533	75	150	80	3,535	1,785	983	128
	CIRCUIT 49.														
(1)	Ashford - - -	617	6	0	1	258	198	47	2	4	8	38	20	4	1
(2)	Canterbury - -	1,191	31	0	1	581	367	191	12	1	11	142	66	28	3
(3)	Deal - - -	278	4	0	2	111	79	24	3	5	2	14	5	5	0
(4)	Dover - - -	622	19	0	4	269	170	88	5	6	4	61	19	7	3
(5)	Faversham - -	577	6	0	0	357	262	82	3	3	7	242	146	44	4
(6)	Folkestone - -	609	6	0	0	233	162	64	1	3	3	68	27	18	0
(7)	Hythe - - -	186	3	0	0	80	40	38	0	0	2	10	4	0	0
(8)	Margate - - -	711	43	0	1	318	182	109	15	9	4	71	27	10	2
(9)	Ramsgate - -	643	25	0	1	299	199	81	5	5	10	109	35	12	4
(10)	Romney - - -	76	0	0	0	38	17	18	2	0	1	15	10	7	5
(11)	Sandwich - -	339	5	0	0	198	129	62	3	2	2	28	17	10	1
(12)	Sittingbourne - -	976	17	0	0	577	343	210	3	12	9	157	100	54	15
(13)	Tenterden and Cranbrook.	250	2	0	0	88	72	12	0	1	3	11	7	4	0
	TOTALS - - -	7,075	167	0	10	3,407	2,220	1,026	54	51	66	966	483	203	38

Executions on Real Estate.	Sales made.	Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceedings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Proceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composition Filed.	Number of Debtors Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
							Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
87	6	0	1	1	33	£. 13,729	£. 6,401	£. 203	£. 1,665	3	0	10	80	44	1 replevin; 1 acknowledgment by a married woman.	(1)
52	20	0	0	0	76	25,369	13,986	276	3,448	8	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
37	6	0	0	0	23	4,686	2,663	49	686	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
76	32	0	1	1	132	43,784	23,050	528	5,799	12	0	10	80	44	2	
65	5	0	0	0	12	2,066	941	68	255	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
88	8	0	0	0	12	2,711	1,220	99	367	3	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
37	5	0	0	1	11	5,437	2,959	93	782	0	0	0	0	0	6 interpleaders and 4 hearings; garnishee summons.	(3)
37	5	0	0	0	22	6,091	2,769	70	787	0	0	1	7	4	0	(4)
56	20	0	0	0	37	10,275	5,722	169	1,672	7	11	9	55	13	5 interpleaders.	(5)
54	0	0	0	0	6	1,232	480	14	149	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
46	1	0	0	0	11	1,905	988	44	279	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
50	2	0	0	0	11	1,773	602	36	186	0	0	0	0	0	7 plaintiffs for recovery of tenement have been issued.	(8)
69	24	0	0	0	13	5,722	2,178	138	608	5	0	8	39	13	0	(9)
502	70	0	0	1	135	37,212	17,859	731	5,085	18	11	18	94	30	22	
98	5	0	0	0	11	1,656	633	6	204	0	0	0	0	0	1 interpleader.	(1)
206	0	0	0	0	11	4,090	2,112	57	538	2	0	10	70	24	0	(2)
49	1	0	0	0	5	888	320	25	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
108	2	0	0	0	11	2,218	1,092	60	269	1	1	0	0	0	0	(4)
106	2	0	0	0	11	1,404	662	7	222	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
63	0	0	0	0	11	1,637	557	27	199	0	0	0	0	0	2 acknowledgments of married women, fees 2/.	(6)
38	0	0	0	0	6	514	179	7	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
119	4	0	0	0	13	3,516	1,627	68	402	1	0	0	0	0	8	(8)
100	3	0	0	0	11	2,763	1,255	52	346	0	4	0	0	0	0	(9)
14	1	0	0	0	6	260	121	2	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
70	1	0	0	0	6	914	489	9	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
264	3	0	0	1	11	2,576	1,269	30	352	1	0	0	0	0	1 application for new trial.	(12)
20	0	0	0	0	11	686	204	3	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
255	22	0	0	1	124	23,122	10,520	353	2,929	6	5	10	70	24	4	

COURT TOWN.		Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £.20.	Above £.20 and not exceeding £.50.	By Agreement above £.50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
CIRCUIT 50.															
(1)	Arundel - - -	502	7	0	2	251	144	99	4	5	1	18	11	5	
(2)	Brighton - - -	5,874	223	0	1	2,753	1,773	887	6	27	61	513	250	143	2
(3)	Chichester - - -	826	25	0	4	344	208	126	1	5	8	143	60	20	3
(4)	Cuckfield - - -	324	9	0	2	196	111	77	2	3	5	60	10	5	3
(5)	Dorking - - -	210	2	0	1	94	62	31	0	1	1	11	7	4	0
(6)	East Grinstead - -	233	11	0	0	96	53	30	2	5	6	7	3	0	0
(7)	Hastings - - -	1,502	45	0	4	623	397	186	3	17	24	135	60	22	8
(8)	Horsham - - -	505	12	0	2	179	116	50	3	1	11	108	34	16	6
(9)	Lewes - - -	1,501	34	1	0	551	415	98	12	10	16	133	55	26	7
(10)	Midhurst - - -	103	6	0	2	54	41	13	0	1	1	20	9	9	0
(11)	Petworth - - -	271	14	0	5	111	71	40	1	1	3	20	5	1	0
(12)	Reigate - - -	625	22	0	3	318	220	77	6	10	8	125	37	13	2
(13)	Rye - - -	119	2	0	1	65	43	21	1	0	1	11	3	1	0
(14)	Worthing - - -	394	6	0	3	138	90	45	4	0	2	27	9	3	1
TOTALS - - -		12,989	418	1	30	5,773	3,744	1,780	45	86	148	1,331	553	268	55
CIRCUIT 51.															
(1)	Alton - - -	230	3	0	0	141	91	41	2	3	4	35	21	9	1
(2)	Basingstoke - - -	527	6	0	1	255	165	74	5	2	10	92	28	8	3
(3)	Bishop's Waltham -	185	5	0	0	89	59	26	0	3	1	19	3	1	0
(4)	Lymington - - -	359	7	0	1	142	98	32	4	5	4	18	11	1	1
(5)	Newport and at Ryde	2,009	66	0	9	785	598	122	31	19	24	360	146	59	8
(6)	Petersfield - - -	199	2	0	0	96	68	24	2	1	1	33	2	2	0
(7)	Portsmouth - - -	4,358	110	0	2	2,097	1,578	383	67	30	41	756	237	136	34
(8)	Romsey - - -	355	15	0	1	147	114	26	1	3	4	39	20	8	1
(9)	Southampton - - -	3,042	80	0	4	1,592	1,086	430	14	27	39	392	155	56	12
(10)	Winchester - - -	1,302	24	0	1	583	282	278	4	7	13	111	37	15	5
TOTALS - - -		12,566	318	0	19	5,927	4,139	1,436	130	100	141	1,855	660	295	65
CIRCUIT 52.															
(1)	Bath - - -	3,584	80	0	4	1,681	961	616	62	32	14	329	140	33	8
(2)	Bradford and Trowbridge.	789	39	0	0	229	147	46	18	13	5	46	21	8	2
(3)	Calne - - -	275	0	0	0	96	69	19	0	3	5	5	5	0	0
(4)	Chippenham - - -	521	6	0	0	240	180	44	7	8	1	69	33	6	1
(5)	Chipping Sodbury -	281	2	0	0	120	80	32	3	4	1	28	14	10	0
(6)	Devizes - - -	572	11	0	1	224	151	62	4	2	6	36	26	6	1
(7)	Frome - - -	1,279	29	0	0	476	326	109	17	14	10	66	21	8	3
(8)	Marlborough - - -	310	5	0	0	126	66	50	3	3	4	13	7	0	0
(9)	Melksham - - -	189	5	0	0	60	38	15	5	1	1	14	5	2	2
(10)	Swindon - - -	2,500	49	0	0	1,080	699	344	9	24	4	219	86	20	3
(11)	Temple Cloud - - -	389	13	0	0	160	104	45	0	4	7	49	18	7	2
(12)	Warminster - - -	405	10	0	0	161	108	46	1	5	1	22	12	4	3
(13)	Westbury - - -	174	2	0	0	45	37	6	1	1	0	5	4	3	3
TOTALS - - -		11,268	251	0	5	4,698	2,966	1,434	130	114	59	901	392	107	28

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
						£.	£.	£.	£.							
119	1	0	1	0	6	1,300	591	22	167	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
056	14	0	0	0	42	24,909	10,577	728	2,847	5	2	6	100	36	0	(2)
35	0	0	0	0	12	2,921	1,092	80	302	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
37	2	0	0	0	6	1,316	890	38	179	1	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
15	0	0	0	0	6	733	272	11	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
46	1	0	0	0	6	1,166	287	13	121	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
161	10	0	0	0	18	5,989	2,486	225	669	3	0	2	24	6	0	(7)
56	0	0	0	0	6	1,612	821	42	201	1	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
147	4	0	0	1	12	4,986	1,972	143	567	4	0	6	25	5	0	(9)
17	0	0	0	0	6	529	326	18	71	1	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
31	0	0	0	0	6	1,106	424	51	113	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
67	1	0	0	0	6	2,792	1,498	60	337	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
16	0	0	0	0	6	446	217	7	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
28	0	0	0	0	6	1,101	595	13	146	1	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
861	33	0	1	1	144	50,906	22,048	1,451	5,853	19	2	14	149	47	0	
55	1	0	0	0	6	834	394	62	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
41	0	0	0	0	11	1,595	910	42	239	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
46	1	0	0	0	6	793	377	16	87	1	0	0	0	0	1 warrant to give possession of tenement issued.	(3)
47	1	0	0	0	6	1,092	392	8	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
189	1	0	0	0	14	8,721	3,027	191	910	1	0	1	29	10	0	(5)
44	1	0	0	0	6	798	347	10	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
758	12	0	0	0	28	17,018	7,270	197	1,570	3	1	18	68	26	0	(7)
46	0	0	0	0	6	1,365	462	35	159	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
428	14	0	0	0	24	11,651	2,972	181	1,365	4	0	16	80	23	0	(9)
159	2	0	0	0	11	3,506	1,551	36	398	1	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
813	33	0	0	0	118	47,313	17,702	778	5,070	11	1	35	177	59	1	
620	10	0	0	0	29	11,574	4,820	206	1,335	1	0	11	84	7	0	(1)
110	4	0	0	0	12	3,723	1,006	103	345	2	0	0	0	0	1	(2)
38	0	0	0	0	6	499	157	33	59	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
70	1	0	0	0	12	1,579	651	29	194	2	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
28	0	0	0	0	9	682	326	20	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
108	3	0	0	0	12	1,648	580	108	199	1	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
184	5	0	0	0	12	4,018	1,448	174	332	0	0	3	18	2	0	(7)
33	1	0	0	0	12	866	346	20	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
33	0	0	0	0	6	595	208	4	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
372	22	0	0	0	12	6,907	3,084	205	852	5	0	4	26	8	0	(10)
45	1	0	0	0	12	1,445	421	70	155	2	0	0	0	0	2 intestacy, 36 & 37 Vict. c. 52.	(11)
49	3	0	0	0	12	1,271	488	25	149	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
17	1	0	0	0	6	458	135	5	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
1,657	51	0	0	0	152	35,205	13,670	1,002	3,928	15	0	18	128	17	3	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrants of Commitment.		
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £ 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict., c. 108, or s. 2 of 29 & 30 Vict., c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors' Imprisoned.	
CIRCUIT 53.																
(1)	Cheltenham - -	2,927	56	0	1	963	516	394	7	18	29	314	128	40	5	
(2)	Cirencester - -	864	14	0	1	284	205	75	0	1	4	74	15	6	1	
(3)	Dursley - - -	598	13	0	0	186	133	38	0	8	7	41	20	9	2	
(4)	Gloucester - -	2,773	85	0	0	1,085	529	437	84	20	15	290	124	40	16	
(5)	Malmesbury - -	659	9	0	0	162	120	34	0	4	4	77	17	9	1	
(6)	Newent - - -	532	3	0	0	221	151	56	3	2	9	61	28	9	2	
(7)	Newnham - - -	2,050	14	0	0	454	339	93	5	11	6	100	21	12	2	
(8)	Northleach - -	162	4	0	0	72	41	28	0	0	3	23	8	3	1	
(9)	Stroud - - -	1,408	18	0	0	439	316	111	6	4	2	176	77	44	5	
(10)	Tewkesbury - -	576	21	1	1	228	132	77	4	12	4	70	29	5	1	
(11)	Thornbury - -	282	4	0	2	131	76	50	0	3	4	13	7	7	3	
(12)	Winchcomb - -	317	2	0	0	113	64	45	0	3	1	59	14	5	1	
	TOTALS - - -	13,148	243	1	5	4,338	2,622	1,438	109	86	88	1,298	488	189	40	
CIRCUIT 54.																
(1)	Axbridge - - -	552	8	0	2	197	135	37	3	9	15	38	18	7	0	
(2)	Bristol - - -	14,763	312	0	16	8,309	4,126	3,252	727	103	117	2,264	1,201	682	94	
(3)	Wells - - -	1,391	20	0	0	508	324	144	10	20	10	82	39	14	1	
(4)	Weston-super-Mare -	942	23	0	0	368	254	92	6	8	8	154	73	30	3	
	TOTALS - - -	17,648	363	0	18	9,382	4,839	3,525	746	140	150	2,536	1,331	733	98	
CIRCUIT 55.																
(1)	Andover - - -	621	10	0	1	186	128	52	1	2	4	88	33	18	4	
(2)	Blandford - - -	662	14	0	1	274	122	140	7	0	6	93	50	19	4	
(3)	Bridport - - -	1,160	15	0	0	331	226	90	1	8	6	125	54	20	1	
(4)	Christchurch - -	610	8	0	0	209	130	63	1	10	5	49	19	3	0	
(5)	Crewkerne - - -	429	6	0	0	128	93	31	3	0	1	17	6	4	1	
(6)	Dorchester - - -	463	11	0	0	197	67	123	3	3	1	30	8	6	3	
(7)	Fordingbridge - -	442	7	0	0	158	63	88	1	4	2	31	8	5	1	
(8)	Poole - - -	474	36	0	1	180	118	50	6	2	5	37	9	11	4	
(9)	Salisbury - - -	1,266	21	0	0	495	320	147	12	2	14	91	34	16	4	
(10)	Shaftesbury - -	790	19	0	1	272	131	125	2	3	12	55	23	5	1	
(11)	Wareham - - -	251	7	0	3	128	96	32	1	1	1	38	13	4	0	
(12)	Weymouth - - -	833	14	0	1	309	185	103	7	4	11	106	43	9	1	
(13)	Wimborne Minster -	558	5	0	3	303	88	210	0	2	6	219	40	19	0	
(14)	Wincanton - - -	624	19	0	0	207	148	46	2	1	10	42	12	4	2	
(15)	Yeovil - - -	1,318	32	0	5	442	322	84	10	11	20	69	37	7	1	
	TOTALS - - -	10,501	224	0	16	3,819	2,237	1,384	57	53	104	1,090	389	150	27	

Executions inst Goods.	Sales made.	Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
							Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
20	3	0	0	0	26	9,587	£. 3,210	£. 236	1,023	8	0	4	45	2	0	(1)
49	1	0	0	0	11	2,422	983	85	265	1	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
47	1	0	0	0	12	2,009	573	57	212	0	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
63	6	0	0	1	26	10,647	3,595	192	1,110	8	2	4	38	6	0	(4)
25	1	0	0	0	11	1,561	427	42	165	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
72	1	0	0	0	6	1,327	574	43	173	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
42	6	0	0	0	16	4,105	1,125	249	462	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
25	0	0	0	0	6	407	154	17	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
82	0	0	0	0	15	3,205	1,050	74	358	2	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
34	1	0	0	0	6	2,015	569	35	190	1	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
44	1	0	0	0	8	637	303	28	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
40	0	0	0	0	6	729	340	20	97	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
37	2	0	0	1	149	38,651	12,903	1,078	4,194	17	2	4	83	8	0	
63	2	0	0	0	11	1,479	438	71	173	1	0	0	0	0	2 Warrants of re- plevin issued.	(1)
41	40	0	0	0	109	54,210	24,248	1,691	6,641	10	13	19	170	25	24 Garnishee sum- monses; 21 inter- pleadersummonses; 7 executions, other than County Courts; 1 replevin case; 1 probate cause, un- der s. 77 of Act 1857.	(2)
09	5	0	0	0	11	3,309	1,238	126	388	5	0	1	8	4	0	(3)
07	2	0	0	0	11	3,149	1,070	75	363	2	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
20	49	0	0	0	142	62,147	26,994	1,963	7,565	18	13	20	178	29	56	
34	0	0	0	0	11	1,721	739	28	191	1	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
28	1	0	0	0	11	1,892	778	26	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
71	1	0	0	0	11	2,672	1,016	175	313	2	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
41	1	0	0	0	6	2,189	669	45	237	0	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
62	6	0	0	0	11	1,271	335	42	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
60	4	0	0	0	11	1,384	521	22	152	1	0	0	21	1	0	(6)
63	1	0	0	0	6	1,427	630	13	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
41	1	1	0	0	11	2,780	984	118	250	0	0	2	14	1	1 Relief of widows and children of in- testates, 36 & 37 Vict., c. 52; 1 Mer- chant Shipping Act, 1865.	(8)
67	8	0	0	0	11	3,908	1,550	84	431	0	0	3	20	4	0	(9)
06	0	0	0	0	11	2,258	769	55	251	1	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
63	0	0	0	0	6	934	377	30	113	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
60	3	0	0	0	11	2,468	1,099	41	294	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
98	0	0	0	0	6	1,507	830	30	191	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
87	5	0	0	0	11	2,025	518	96	212	1	0	0	0	0	0	(14)
32	3	0	0	0	11	4,250	1,258	106	449	2	0	4	30	3	0	(15)
313	34	1	0	0	145	32,686	12,073	911	3,602	10	0	9	85	9	2	

	COURT TOWN.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summons.		Warrants of Commitment.	
		Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, s. 28, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, or s. 2 of 29 & 30 Vict. c. 142.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
CIRCUIT 57.															
(1)	Axminster - - -	499	12	0	0	227	92	112	9	7	7	14	9	0	0
(2)	Barnstaple - - -	1,389	51	0	1	451	270	125	46	9	2	48	36	3	1
(3)	Bideford - - -	839	17	0	2	441	346	73	14	8	2	71	25	6	0
(4)	Bridgwater - - -	1,366	29	1	0	622	369	203	12	19	19	83	45	3	0
(5)	Chard - - - -	485	14	0	0	179	70	101	1	5	2	26	6	0	0
(6)	Honiton - - -	649	18	0	2	234	159	67	0	8	2	16	16	1	0
(7)	Langport - - -	611	11	0	0	152	108	32	3	6	3	25	10	4	0
(8)	South Molton - -	327	12	0	0	90	65	17	2	3	3	9	4	1	0
(9)	Taunton - - -	1,306	36	0	1	482	232	208	19	13	11	35	5	2	1
(10)	Tiverton - - -	886	31	0	2	309	205	81	14	8	3	47	14	1	0
(11)	Torrington - - -	324	14	0	1	113	75	32	2	1	4	7	8	3	0
(12)	Wellington (Somerset)	564	13	0	0	172	116	41	5	5	5	26	0	1	0
(13)	Williton - - -	562	12	0	1	191	139	40	2	6	5	29	6	3	1
	TOTALS - - -	9,807	270	1	10	3,663	2,246	1,132	129	98	68	436	184	28	3
CIRCUIT 58.															
(1)	Crediton - - -	453	3	0	0	206	142	54	6	1	3	33	14	6	1
(2)	East Stonehouse -	5,949	113	0	7	3,741	2,381	1,156	101	60	50	569	366	195	28
(3)	Exeter - - - -	3,793	53	0	9	2,063	1,333	619	65	30	25	229	123	63	5
(4)	Kingsbridge - - -	310	10	0	1	170	94	67	2	3	5	7	3	4	1
(5)	Newton Abbot and Torquay.	2,036	56	0	7	1,183	869	263	25	18	15	129	74	46	9
(6)	Okehampton - - -	375	17	0	1	117	86	25	4	1	2	13	4	2	1
(7)	Tavistock - - -	1,005	11	0	0	389	251	118	7	8	5	64	40	25	0
(8)	Totnes and Churston Ferrers.	670	20	0	6	330	212	100	9	8	7	154	39	17	0
	TOTALS - - -	14,591	283	0	31	8,199	5,368	2,402	219	129	112	1,198	663	358	55
CIRCUIT 59.															
(1)	Bodmin - - - -	471	12	0	0	243	108	127	9	5	3	24	2	2	1
(2)	Camelford - - -	291	5	0	0	147	99	43	2	2	1	3	3	1	1
(3)	Falmouth - - -	592	8	0	3	343	144	182	1	12	7	28	10	4	1
(4)	Helston - - - -	365	12	0	0	187	83	98	2	3	1	2	0	0	0
(5)	Holsworthy - - -	375	12	0	1	138	86	48	0	2	3	5	1	0	0
(6)	Launceston - - -	589	18	0	3	322	206	99	12	2	6	14	7	5	1
(7)	Liskeard - - - -	980	20	0	2	596	431	142	5	18	2	44	16	5	11
(8)	Penzance - - -	1,115	18	0	5	642	479	141	7	17	3	61	21	13	11
(9)	Redruth - - - -	2,102	31	0	1	1,383	929	406	10	33	6	136	56	14	0
(10)	St. Austell - - -	1,053	26	0	0	595	393	191	3	6	2	33	11	7	0
(11)	St. Columb - - -	292	11	0	1	157	80	69	1	6	2	7	4	5	0
(12)	Truro - - - - -	1,750	26	0	0	776	292	452	18	5	9	70	38	18	0
	TOTALS - - -	9,975	199	0	16	5,529	3,330	1,998	61	111	45	427	169	74	4

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Pro- ceedings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Proceeding had in the Court not included in the foregoing Columns.	
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively)	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
67	4	0	0	0	7	£. 1,605	£. 783	£. 47	£. 217	2	0	0	0	0	2 interpleader suits ; taking the acknow- ledgments of 5 mar- ried women.	(1)
64	1	0	0	0	13	5,009	1,601	227	521	4	0	6	37	8	1 interpleader hearing, 17. 4s.	(2)
138	6	0	0	0	12	2,371	862	39	282	1	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
285	2	0	0	0	12	4,918	1,755	116	562	0	1	0	22	4	4 replevins.	(4)
53	3	0	0	0	12	1,503	483	16	152	1	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
83	5	0	1	1	12	2,053	813	66	203	2	0	0	0	0	1 interpleader.	(6)
58	0	0	0	0	12	1,580	352	55	170	1	0	0	0	0	3 warrants of possession.	(7)
35	1	0	0	0	6	1,256	379	17	143	1	0	0	0	0	1 under Intestates, Widows, and Children Act.	(8)
140	2	0	0	0	12	4,672	1,462	160	473	3	0	4	28	5	0	(9)
138	0	0	0	0	12	3,194	858	63	303	0	0	0	0	0	0	(10)
92	0	0	0	0	7	1,285	425	34	120	1	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
43	2	0	0	0	12	1,648	531	37	156	1	0	0	0	0	0	(12)
45	1	0	0	0	12	1,538	539	35	169	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)
281	27	0	1	1	141	32,632	10,843	912	3,471	17	1	10	87	17	17	
63	1	0	0	0	6	1,035	259	28	128	2	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
386	28	0	0	0	46	18,517	9,771	559	2,475	9	4	10	64	10	4 Intestates, Widows, and Children Act, 1873.	(2)
834	12	0	0	1	33	10,592	5,067	315	1,412	5	0	14	75	14	1 replevin.	(3)
46	0	0	0	0	6	975	179	21	111	1	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
474	16	0	0	0	18	6,295	3,367	122	908	2	0	2	0	0	1 cause remitted by Probate Court for trial.	(5)
37	3	0	0	0	6	1,442	405	42	154	2	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
167	2	0	0	0	11	2,726	788	62	349	1	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
117	2	0	0	0	12	2,821	1,062	137	328	0	4	0	0	0	0	(8)
124	64	0	0	1	138	44,403	20,898	1,286	5,865	22	8	26	139	24	6	
65	1	0	0	0	6	1,336	698	47	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)
50	0	0	0	0	6	752	335	15	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2)
222	2	0	0	0	11	1,465	767	36	220	6	0	0	0	0	0	(3)
87	0	0	0	1	6	1,577	607	29	178	1	0	0	0	0	0	(4)
30	1	0	0	0	6	1,432	399	0	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5)
130	1	0	0	0	11	1,761	947	55	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	(6)
245	1	0	0	0	11	2,540	1,270	68	356	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7)
373	7	0	0	0	12	3,712	1,810	107	483	0	0	0	0	0	0	(8)
509	5	0	1	0	11	5,001	2,682	34	701	1	0	0	0	0	0	(9)
304	3	0	0	0	11	3,655	1,625	66	346	0	0	0	0	0	Hearing of case sent from Court of Pro- bate for grant of probate.	(10)
63	0	0	0	0	6	1,272	669	38	156	2	0	0	0	0	0	(11)
399	9	0	0	1	16	4,341	2,292	71	586	1	16	5	36	10	0	(12)
2,477	30	0	1	2	113	28,844	14,101	566	3,641	11	16	5	36	10	1	

SUMMARY.

CIRCUITS.	Plaints Entered.			Causes Determined.		Judgments.					Judgment Summonses.		Warrants of Commitment.	
	Not exceeding £. 20.	Above £. 20 and not exceeding £. 50.	By Agreement above £. 50.	With a Jury.	Without a Jury.	For Plaintiff.	For Plaintiff by Consent or Admission.	For Plaintiff by Default, &c. 19 & 20 Vict. c. 113, or s. 26 of 30 & 31 Vict. c. 112.	Nonsuit.	For Defendant.	Issued.	Heard.	Issued.	Debtors Imprisoned.
Circuit 1 -	8,982	261	3	26	5,446	3,687	1,492	91	120	82	1,030	624	348	53
" 2 -	16,910	276	0	14	11,010	7,857	2,813	76	115	163	1,247	624	317	69
" 3 -	11,318	329	1	22	6,618	4,597	1,657	102	91	193	1,491	860	559	76
" 4 -	10,950	252	0	9	6,472	3,695	2,154	185	280	167	865	394	143	49
" 5 -	16,105	174	1	21	10,567	6,345	3,813	106	55	269	1,191	533	238	70
" 6 -	27,689	467	0	53	17,446	10,318	6,152	339	471	219	3,138	1,904	327	127
" 7 -	23,095	314	0	40	13,472	7,074	6,012	67	257	102	6,289	4,079	2,084	420
" 8 -	24,615	245	1	3	15,891	9,945	5,120	135	307	387	2,121	1,115	311	77
" 9 -	15,658	214	0	8	8,881	5,817	2,750	44	117	161	2,536	1,441	747	153
" 11 -	12,845	454	2	9	7,695	4,780	2,264	326	197	137	495	197	72	26
" 12 -	24,590	423	0	17	15,520	8,242	6,475	323	390	107	2,148	1,424	779	149
" 13 -	25,681	254	1	7	18,486	10,256	7,902	55	154	126	1,453	574	90	39
" 14 -	29,260	565	0	26	18,879	10,591	6,806	894	441	173	2,924	1,871	1,177	183
" 15 -	14,868	462	0	12	7,791	5,022	2,228	219	94	240	1,034	486	282	62
" 16 -	11,971	318	0	29	6,779	4,452	1,717	319	144	176	1,219	487	90	16
" 17 -	11,565	298	0	28	6,359	3,838	2,045	121	197	186	1,027	470	304	47
" 18 -	18,000	332	2	14	11,725	8,264	2,889	225	197	164	1,797	1,156	622	120
" 19 -	21,314	223	0	23	14,399	7,817	6,159	115	136	195	4,113	2,378	1,100	211
" 20 -	22,860	303	0	28	15,044	7,438	6,894	406	181	153	3,778	2,350	1,330	211
" 21 -	34,673	466	0	5	23,639	11,918	10,355	1,029	57	285	3,259	1,370	631	141
" 22 -	14,067	247	1	26	7,710	4,536	2,743	224	90	143	1,706	975	505	75
" 23 -	19,414	231	0	5	13,359	7,743	5,211	126	79	205	2,888	1,170	620	75
" 24 -	15,503	362	0	8	8,295	4,943	3,011	156	114	79	898	385	76	16
" 25 -	22,004	295	0	4	15,918	7,636	7,581	452	143	105	2,389	1,372	656	83
" 26 -	20,369	223	0	49	14,002	8,134	5,496	175	122	124	1,277	561	255	38
" 27 -	11,284	237	0	7	6,015	2,703	2,941	189	7	182	1,423	763	450	60
" 28 -	6,251	156	1	18	2,802	1,765	844	69	59	83	530	257	97	9
" 29 -	12,494	289	1	19	6,174	4,105	1,746	110	114	118	1,526	744	370	46
" 30 -	16,448	363	1	20	10,581	7,312	2,988	98	76	127	2,001	1,387	819	98
" 31 -	8,941	246	1	7	3,771	2,684	928	78	44	44	352	147	104	11
" 32 -	7,703	164	0	12	3,305	1,997	990	161	68	101	366	125	54	10
" 33 -	10,787	239	0	6	5,070	3,462	1,317	99	68	130	1,201	498	187	34
" 34 -	13,660	220	2	23	6,779	4,439	2,037	76	97	153	892	405	136	26
" 35 -	10,152	183	0	5	5,301	3,322	1,783	84	48	69	790	380	201	24
" 36 -	12,360	256	0	30	5,947	4,125	1,550	86	43	173	1,641	895	441	72
" 37 -	11,746	160	0	11	5,743	3,609	1,865	71	122	87	1,068	553	296	69
" 38 -	9,297	94	0	15	5,885	2,920	2,370	239	197	174	1,106	410	192	32
" 39 -	17,846	165	0	39	10,925	5,080	4,856	369	272	387	1,821	704	300	55
" 40 -	13,501	152	0	9	7,510	3,385	3,459	209	176	290	1,715	610	218	60
" 41 -	10,550	183	1	14	5,873	2,897	2,329	212	152	297	1,506	668	239	31
" 42 -	16,154	276	0	27	9,321	5,487	3,186	83	177	415	3,275	1,318	705	142
" 43 -	12,043	272	0	14	6,145	3,741	1,884	198	80	256	1,980	726	297	55
" 44 -	14,719	271	0	23	7,895	5,081	2,394	164	119	160	2,183	1,016	449	73
" 45 -	12,594	118	0	10	7,207	3,463	3,107	385	88	174	996	416	181	39
" 46 -	13,635	171	0	21	8,601	3,883	3,951	138	296	354	1,822	962	445	125
" 47 -	13,777	213	0	15	7,495	4,672	2,533	75	150	80	3,535	1,785	983	128
" 48 -	7,075	167	0	10	3,407	2,220	1,026	54	51	66	966	483	203	38
" 49 -	12,989	418	1	30	5,773	3,744	1,780	45	86	148	1,331	553	268	55
" 50 -	12,566	318	0	19	5,927	4,139	1,436	130	100	141	1,855	660	295	65
" 51 -	11,268	251	0	5	4,698	2,966	1,434	130	114	59	901	392	107	28
" 52 -	13,148	243	1	5	4,338	2,622	1,438	109	86	88	1,298	488	189	40
" 53 -	17,648	363	0	18	9,382	4,839	3,525	746	140	150	2,536	1,331	733	98
" 54 -	10,501	224	0	16	3,819	2,237	1,384	57	53	104	1,090	389	150	27
" 55 -	9,807	270	1	10	3,663	2,246	1,132	129	98	68	436	184	28	3
" 56 -	14,591	283	0	31	8,199	5,368	2,402	219	129	112	1,198	663	358	55
" 57 -	9,975	199	0	16	5,529	3,330	1,998	61	111	45	427	169	74	4
TOTALS -	849,816	15,202	22	991	494,483	288,788	178,352	11,183	7,975	9,176	96,080	47,871	23,232	4,198
CITY OF LONDON COURT -	14,140	220	0	54	6,054	4,077	1,073	474	234	250	735	252	67	5

SUMMARY.

Executions against Goods.		Appeals.	Orders to Stay Proceed- ings.	Certiorari to Remove Proceedings.	Total Number of Days Court has Sat.	Total Amount for which Plaints Entered.	Judgments obtained by Plaintiffs on Original Hearings.		Total Amount of Fees on all Proceed- ings.	Number of Equitable Proceedings.	Number of Admiralty Proceedings.	Number of Bankruptcy Petitions Filed.	Number of Petitions for Liquidation or Composi- tion Filed.	Number of Debtors' Summons in Bankruptcy Issued.	Enumerate any other Pro- ceeding had in the Court not included in the fore- going Columns.	CIRCUITS.
Issued.	Sales made.						Amount of Debts (exclusively).	Amount of Costs (exclusive of Fees).								
						£.	£.	£.	£.							
1,525	14	2	8	1	149	37,720	15,596	1,368	4,668	8	36	38	184	65	1	1
3,100	82	0	0	0	140	50,153	26,521	1,381	7,020	13	27	11	108	24	2	2
2,759	43	0	0	0	125	42,176	20,894	1,464	5,916	15	4	14	101	27	9	3
2,803	114	2	0	0	158	39,077	17,271	785	5,173	6	3	11	108	27	16	4
6,541	238	0	0	0	101	39,917	23,651	601	6,287	11	0	18	142	29	0	5
5,531	84	2	0	2	338	87,514	45,415	1,722	12,684	11	68	58	272	163	11	6
5,174	117	1	0	0	135	61,642	36,520	1,489	9,548	20	0	12	105	26	2	7
5,264	94	1	6	1	127	57,454	32,270	631	8,400	7	0	61	366	135	1	8
2,885	114	0	0	1	150	40,582	20,008	829	5,566	16	0	17	110	28	9	9
2,698	111	0	0	0	163	54,294	24,349	1,696	6,544	21	0	37	203	98	11	11
5,778	137	0	0	1	164	76,429	37,185	1,115	9,865	9	0	20	252	60	5	12
7,028	105	0	0	2	129	64,906	39,396	798	9,492	4	0	22	134	34	0	13
7,310	109	2	0	1	137	92,970	46,659	1,183	12,699	19	0	20	265	81	16	14
2,322	51	2	0	0	137	55,077	24,442	2,765	6,549	15	0	24	188	29	1	15
2,212	41	1	3	0	170	42,752	18,024	1,038	5,139	15	33	15	124	29	0	16
1,986	35	1	0	1	145	38,531	17,043	1,033	4,884	19	21	14	88	19	2	17
5,346	63	0	0	0	116	53,025	26,571	841	7,440	17	0	10	92	31	0	18
5,460	109	1	0	0	133	59,183	29,012	733	7,691	3	0	13	74	13	1	19
5,364	82	0	1	0	144	59,533	32,347	1,089	8,493	8	0	12	54	18	0	20
5,318	309	1	0	0	170	111,088	60,657	3,241	14,646	15	0	31	402	47	4	21
2,547	56	0	0	0	149	40,780	18,288	698	5,031	6	0	19	91	23	1	22
4,924	63	0	9	1	141	49,162	27,570	1,449	7,038	12	0	2	130	31	0	23
3,055	76	0	1	4	134	50,121	19,191	733	5,692	21	53	21	125	24	3	24
5,564	143	0	0	4	144	58,024	35,272	1,626	8,345	15	0	11	162	27	8	25
6,387	149	0	0	0	136	53,183	29,988	909	7,752	13	0	19	144	28	0	26
2,450	43	0	0	0	172	35,538	16,583	824	4,207	7	0	8	78	8	1	27
958	44	0	0	0	114	23,582	9,959	536	2,796	11	0	5	36	4	1	28
2,121	23	0	0	0	118	43,023	18,912	1,261	5,307	23	3	11	115	23	4	29
4,670	54	2	0	0	138	56,135	29,551	1,808	7,600	15	21	13	102	15	12	30
1,728	30	0	0	0	106	31,889	12,245	1,024	3,647	18	2	12	86	7	7	31
1,257	33	0	7	0	122	28,671	8,983	960	2,906	13	6	16	91	9	0	32
1,697	38	0	0	0	182	34,288	13,737	1,192	4,320	11	01	17	113	14	1	33
2,420	53	2	0	1	151	38,567	15,824	795	4,742	10	0	18	105	16	4	35
1,842	37	1	0	1	134	34,746	13,551	439	4,032	7	0	11	92	19	0	36
1,553	77	0	0	2	146	40,414	16,790	1,038	4,853	6	0	14	111	27	1	37
1,775	24	0	0	0	158	33,919	15,019	769	4,153	12	2	18	108	27	4	38
2,210	9	0	2	0	116	27,105	13,619	597	3,537	2	0	0	0	0	4	39
4,050	84	2	0	1	153	54,723	27,279	1,539	7,133	11	0	0	0	0	47	40
2,306	41	0	0	0	152	45,448	24,368	1,492	6,157	11	0	0	0	0	0	41
1,918	19	1	0	0	160	44,677	23,090	803	5,852	8	0	0	0	0	0	42
2,563	12	0	0	3	150	61,552	32,411	3,268	8,858	23	0	6	26	18	4	43
2,127	26	0	0	0	125	61,649	27,909	899	7,851	16	0	0	0	0	0	44
2,193	45	3	2	4	134	52,881	25,453	1,935	6,907	21	0	37	227	117	0	45
2,686	14	0	0	0	129	43,895	21,331	951	5,630	2	0	0	0	0	96	46
2,676	32	0	1	1	132	43,784	23,050	523	5,799	12	0	10	80	44	2	47
2,502	70	0	0	1	135	37,212	17,859	731	5,085	18	11	18	94	30	22	48
1,255	22	0	0	1	124	23,122	10,520	353	2,929	6	5	10	70	24	4	49
1,861	33	0	1	1	144	50,906	22,048	1,451	5,853	19	2	14	149	47	0	50
1,813	33	0	0	0	118	47,313	17,702	778	5,070	11	1	35	177	59	1	51
1,657	51	0	0	0	152	35,205	13,670	1,002	3,928	15	0	18	123	17	3	52
1,237	2	0	0	1	149	38,651	12,903	1,073	4,194	17	2	4	83	8	0	53
3,720	49	0	0	0	142	62,147	26,994	1,963	7,565	18	13	20	178	29	56	54
1,313	34	1	0	0	145	32,686	12,073	911	3,602	10	0	9	85	9	2	55
1,281	27	0	1	1	141	32,632	10,343	912	3,471	17	1	10	87	17	17	57
3,124	64	0	0	1	138	44,403	20,898	1,286	5,865	22	8	26	139	24	6	58
2,477	30	0	1	2	113	28,844	14,101	566	3,641	11	16	5	36	10	1	59
176,321	3,643	28	43	41	8,028	2,684,900	1,293,409	64,901	350,152	722	399	895	6,620	1,738	403	
1,947	35	0	0	1	166	63,156	25,488	2,289	8,427	10	300	0	0	0	0	

COUNTY COURTS:—RETURN of EQUITABLE SUITS or PROCEEDINGS, under

CIRCUIT.	Total Number of Equitable Suits or Pro- ceedings.	Number of Plaints Entered.						Number of Petitions or Notices		
		For the Adminis- tration of Estates.	For the Execution of Trusts.	For Foreclosure or Redemption, or for Enforcing any Charge or Lien.	For Specific Perform- ance.	For Delivering up or Cancelling any Agreement for Sale or Purchase.	For the Dissolution or Winding-up of a Partnership.	For the Appoint- ment or Removal of Trustees.	For any other Purpose under Trustee Acts.	For the Main- tenance or Advance- ment of Infants.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Circuit 1 -	8	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	0
" 2 -	13	5	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0
" 3 -	15	6	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	1
" 4 -	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
" 5 -	11	7	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
" 6 -	11	5	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
" 7 -	20	11	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	0
" 8 -	7	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
" 9 -	16	4	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0
" 11 -	21	14	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0
" 12 -	9	4	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	0
" 13 -	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
" 14 -	19	5	0	1	2	2	1	0	7	0
" 15 -	15	4	0	1	3	0	2	1	1	0
" 16 -	15	4	0	2	2	1	3	0	1	1
" 17 -	19	4	2	6	0	0	2	0	0	1
" 18 -	17	7	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0
" 19 -	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
" 20 -	8	2	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	0
" 21 -	15	3	0	2	0	0	3	1	3	0
" 22 -	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
" 23 -	12	5	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0
" 24 -	21	7	0	4	3	0	2	0	2	0
" 25 -	15	4	0	3	5	0	0	0	2	0
" 26 -	13	2	0	3	1	0	2	2	3	0
" 27 -	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
" 28 -	11	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1
" 29 -	23	12	0	1	3	0	1	0	2	0
" 30 -	15	7	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0
" 31 -	18	11	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0
" 32 -	13	5	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
" 33 -	11	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
" 35 -	10	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	1
" 36 -	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
" 37 -	6	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
" 38 -	12	3	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	1
" 39 -	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
" 40 -	11	3	0	2	1	0	2	0	3	0
" 41 -	11	4	0	2	1	0	2	0	1	0
" 42 -	8	1	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	0
" 43 -	23	9	1	3	3	0	1	0	3	0
" 44 -	16	4	4	1	1	0	0	1	3	0
" 45 -	21	5	0	6	5	0	0	1	1	0
" 46 -	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
" 47 -	12	3	1	1	3	0	1	2	1	0
" 48 -	18	4	0	2	4	0	1	0	2	0
" 49 -	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
" 50 -	19	3	0	4	1	0	2	1	3	1
" 51 -	11	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0
" 52 -	15	4	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	0
" 53 -	17	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	1
" 54 -	18	3	1	2	6	0	0	0	4	1
" 55 -	10	2	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	0
" 57 -	17	4	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	1
" 58 -	22	8	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	0
" 59 -	11	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0
TOTALS -	722	244	16	82	99	7	53	25	78	16
CITY of LONDON Court -	10	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	4	0

the Act of 28 & 29 Vict. c. 99, in the Year ending 31st December 1874.

Filed. For Partition.	For Injunctions.	Number of Instances of Payment, &c. by Trustees under Section 24 of Act, 1867.	Amount of Subject- Matter in Dispute or otherwise.	Amount of Attorneys' Costs Allowed.	Amount of Fees.			Number of Suits or Proceedings Pending, 31 Dec. 1874.	Number of Appeals.	Number Com- mitted for Con- tempt.	Number of Warrants of Execution, Possession, &c.	CIRCUIT.
					Con- solidated Fund.	Registrar.	High Bailiff.					
11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.	21.	22.	
			£.	£.	£.	£.	£.					
0	0	1	2,734	24	9	12	2	1	0	0	0	1
0	2	1	2,870	237	14	57	13	3	0	0	0	2
2	0	1	1,368	123	26	32	18	4	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	158	2	11	16	8	2	0	0	0	4
0	1	0	800	98	18	53	24	7	0	0	0	5
0	0	0	2,927	94	12	20	40	4	0	0	0	6
0	2	0	2,099	44	22	32	11	5	0	0	1	7
0	0	0	2,050	134	12	7	3	1	0	0	0	8
2	3	0	3,038	96	18	40	12	3	1	0	0	9
2	1	0	722	40	29	68	25	10	0	0	0	11
0	0	0	2,594	142	15	27	8	6	0	0	0	12
0	0	1	20	0	3	3	1	3	0	0	0	13
0	1	0	2,273	178	19	60	15	10	0	0	0	14
1	2	0	2,905	97	12	21	11	7	0	0	0	15
0	1	0	3,811	81	25	35	15	7	0	0	0	16
0	0	4	1,664	95	27	35	13	4	0	0	1	17
2	1	3	1,500	53	32	42	22	7	1	0	0	18
0	0	1	110	16	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	19
0	0	0	646	130	7	21	7	3	0	0	0	20
0	3	0	4,246	106	13	30	9	7	0	0	0	21
0	0	0	741	162	12	56	18	2	0	0	2	22
2	0	0	2,570	18	16	17	9	8	0	0	0	23
0	1	0	2,877	157	32	75	21	8	0	0	1	24
0	0	1	2,296	108	20	24	15	8	0	0	0	25
0	0	0	1,207	227	22	24	10	3	0	0	0	26
1	0	0	1,012	111	7	15	2	0	0	0	0	27
0	2	0	351	0	20	33	10	6	0	0	0	28
0	0	4	2,617	61	29	37	18	10	0	0	0	29
1	0	0	4,949	62	24	25	7	8	0	0	0	30
1	0	0	2,030	138	22	30	15	14	0	0	0	31
0	1	1	1,313	104	19	28	8	2	0	0	0	32
0	1	2	526	79	18	25	10	3	0	0	0	33
0	0	0	1,257	146	19	41	9	0	0	0	1	35
0	0	0	412	0	9	6	1	1	0	0	0	36
0	1	0	700	0	6	17	2	3	0	0	0	37
0	1	0	1,177	69	14	14	8	4	0	0	0	38
0	0	0	0	0	4	10	1	1	0	0	0	39
0	0	0	1,277	82	25	48	8	6	0	0	0	40
1	0	0	213	205	14	27	5	4	0	0	0	41
0	0	0	212	33	10	14	2	2	0	0	0	42
1	2	0	1,800	176	29	54	10	9	0	1	0	43
0	2	0	1,085	218	22	31	8	7	0	1	0	44
0	2	1	3,083	301	37	57	28	15	0	1	0	45
0	0	0	500	0	4	3	1	1	0	0	0	46
0	0	0	2,204	162	13	26	14	2	1	0	0	47
0	3	2	1,239	229	24	39	13	4	0	0	0	48
0	0	1	289	45	4	10	5	3	0	0	0	49
0	1	3	2,520	195	35	63	28	6	0	0	1	50
0	0	0	1,902	0	12	36	10	6	0	0	0	51
0	1	3	1,743	274	29	45	11	3	0	0	0	52
0	0	8	2,065	59	13	26	5	5	0	0	0	53
0	1	0	1,525	159	26	49	24	9	0	0	0	54
1	0	0	849	37	10	10	2	4	0	0	0	55
2	1	0	2,543	24	19	28	13	8	0	0	0	57
0	1	2	6,884	207	43	66	27	11	0	0	0	58
1	1	1	1,774	0	17	39	8	7	0	0	0	59
22	39	41	98,287	5,738	1,006	1,763	614	287	3	3	7	
0	0	0	1,975	59	19	14	3	2	1	0	0	

SUMMARY.

COUNTY COURTS:—RETURN OF ADMIRALTY SUITS OR PROCEEDINGS, in the Year ending 31st December 1874, under the "County Courts Admiralty Jurisdiction Act, 1869."

CIRCUIT.	Total Number of Admiralty Suits or Proceedings.	Arrests of Vessels.	Final Decrees.	If Judge assisted by Assessors.	Amount of Claims.	Amount of Attorneys' Costs allowed.	Amount of Fees.			Suits or Proceedings pending, 31 December 1873.	Appeals.	Warrants of Execution, &c.	Vessels Sold.		REMARKS.
							Court Fund.	Registrar.	High Bailiff.				Amount realised.	Costs of Sale.	
					£.	£.	£.	£.	£.				£.	£.	
1. Newcastle -	36	23	8	4	3,796	202	62	43	29	0	0	0	0	0	
2. Hartlepool and Sunderland.	27	12	13	6	3,407	186	60	61	27	8*	1	0	0	0	
3. Whitehaven -	4	1	1	1	158	0	4	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	
4. Preston - -	3	3	0	0	73	0	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	
6. Liverpool - -	68	8	28	9	4,451	422	108	77	20	28*	0	2	0	0	
16. Kingston-upon-Hull.	33	16	10	7	4,587	422	69	77	39	12*	0	0	0	0	
17. Great Grimsby -	21	12	2	2	3,178	57	37	28	16	6	1	0	0	0	
24. Cardiff and Newport.	53	36	11	1	7,193	238	107	118	49	4	0	1	170	32	
29. Bangor - -	3	1	2	3	415	16	11	11	4	0	0	1	74	4	
30. Swansea - -	21	15	10	5	2,408	160	40	50	18	2	1	0	0	0	
31. Carmarthen - -	2	1	0	0	500	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	
32. King's Lynn -	6	2	2	6	367	40	7	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	
33. Great Yarmouth, Ipswich, and Lowestoft.	61	14	26	12	6,116	278	114	98	23	12*	0	1	0	0	
38. Colchester - -	2	0	0	0	250	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
48. Rochester - -	11	1	9	1	269	40	7	12	8	1	0	2	0	0	
49. Dover and Ramsgate.	5	2	2	0	375	51	6	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	
50. Brighton - -	2	1	0	0	36	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
51. Portsmouth -	1	0	0	0	100	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Suit transferred to High Court of Admiralty.
53. Gloucester - -	2	2	2	0	450	0	6	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	
54. Bristol - -	13	7	1	0	566	0	14	7	11	1	0	0	0	0	
57. Bridgwater - -	1	1	0	0	50	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
58. East Stonehouse, and Totnes, and Churston Ferrers.	8	4	5	3	1,080	49	19	22	18	0	0	1	395	9	
59. Truro - -	16	9	6	4	2,721	124	41	47	50	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTALS - - -	399	171	138	64	42,546	2,285	725	684	344	76	3	9	639	45	
CITY OF LONDON COURT - -	300	90	79	13	29,278	2,069†	469	385	99	123	7	3	159	1	Five suits transferred to High Court of Admiralty.

* It is believed that the majority of the suits returned as pending in the Great Yarmouth, Hartlepool, Hull, Liverpool, Lowestoft, and City of London Courts, have been settled out of Court.

† In many instances the attorneys agreed upon the costs, and settled the cases out of Court; consequently, they are not included in this Return.

RETURN of CAUSES sent from a SUPERIOR COURT to be Tried in a COUNTY COURT.

CIRCUIT.	Court Town.	Causes sent for Trial from Superior Courts under Section 26 of Act of 1856.		Causes sent from Superior Court under Section 7 of Act of 1867.				Actions of Tort remitted under Section 10 of Act of 1867.			
		Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Amount of Costs Allowed.		Amount of Damages.		Amount of Costs Allowed.	
						Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.	Claimed.	Awarded.	Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.
1	Berwick	Damages for breach of contract	£. s. d. 31 4 3	-	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	-	-	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
1	Gateshead	Goods sold - - - - -	17 8 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	Morpeth	Money due on a promissory note. Goods bargained, sold, and delivered.	40 - - 30 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1	Newcastle - on Tyne	Goods sold, work and labour - Goods sold - - - - - ditto - - - - - ditto - - - - - ditto - - - - - ditto - - - - - ditto - - - - - On an acceptance - - - Goods sold - - - - - Work and labour - - - Goods sold - - - - -	26 - - 29 - - 39 - - 34 - - 50 - - 21 - - 23 - - 50 - - 35 - - 48 - - 25 - - 50 - -	Work and labour - Commission - - - - -	25 - - 41 - -	-	-	300 - -	25 - -	-	23 - -
2	Durham	Goods sold and work done -	53 - -	Goods sold - - - - -	25 - -	3 10 6	1 18 -	-	-	-	-
2	Hartlepool -	Bills of exchange - - Goods sold, work done, materials provided, and money paid.	47 10 7 100 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	South Shields	- - - - -	-	Goods sold - - - - -	98 - -	-	-	50 - -	-	-	-
2	Sunderland -	Goods sold and delivered -	50 - -	-	-	-	-	1,000 - -	-	-	-
3	Carlisle	Dishonoured bill - - -	20 19 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Penrith	Goods sold and delivered -	38 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Ulverston and Barrow-in-Furness.	Goods sold and work - Work done - - - - - Horse sold - - - - -	20 - - 25 - - 20 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Blackburn	- - - - -	-	-	-	-	-	800 - -	50 - -	12 14 5	12 4 8
4	Lancaster	Breach of contract and money owing on account stated.	70 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	Preston	Goods sold - - - - - ditto - - - - -	76 3 5 36 11 9	Sheep sold - - - - -	26 5 -	2 5 10	10 14 2	-	-	-	-

RETURN of Causes sent from a Superior Court to be Tried in a County Court—continued.

CIRCUIT.	Court Town.	Causes sent for Trial from Superior Courts under Section 26 of Act of 1856.		Causes sent from Superior Court under Section 7 of Act of 1867.				Actions of Tort remitted under Section 10 of Act of 1867.				
		Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Amount of Costs Allowed.		Nature of Action in each Case.	Amount of Damages.		Amount of Costs Allowed.	
						Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.		Claimed.	Awarded.	Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.
5	Oldham	Goods sold and delivered, and interest.	£. s. d. 50 - -	-	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	-	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
5	Rochdale	-	-	-	-	-	-	Personal injuries	500 - -	Action tried 7th January 1875, when 25 <i>l.</i> awarded.	- -	Not taxed.
6	Liverpool	Goods sold and money paid	35 - -	Work and money paid	31 - -	Settled	-	Damage to plaintiff	-	-	-	-
		Goods sold	27 - -	Money received	25 - -	Struck out	-		100 - -	Nonsuit	-	Costs not taxed.
		ditto	37 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Money had and received, and interest.	20 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Goods sold	27 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
6	Ormskirk	Goods sold and interest	49 - -	-	-	-	-	Goods sold	-	-	-	-
		Goods sold	22 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Goods sold, work done, and money paid.	81 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Goods sold and money paid	23 - -	Goods sold	30 - -	5 - -	10 - -		-	-	-	-
		Goods sold	26 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
6	Ormskirk	ditto	25 - -	-	-	-	-	Goods sold	-	-	-	-
		Bill of exchange	30 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Money due on promissory note	50 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Money lent and interest	25 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Money lent, money paid, money had and received, and money found to be due from the defendant to the plaintiff on accounts stated between them.	10 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
6	St. Helens	Goods bargained and sold, goods sold and delivered, money paid, and money found to be due from the defendant to the plaintiff on accounts stated between them.	34 - -	-	-	-	-	Goods sold	-	-	-	-
		Goods sold and money paid	50 - -	Goods sold	27 10 -	-	-		-	-	-	-
		Commission and work done	77 - -	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-
7	Altrincham	Goods sold	29 - -	Balance of account rendered for goods.	24 - -	4 - -	24 - -	-	-	-	-	-
7	Birkenhead	-	-	Contract	56 - -	-	-	Assault	1,000 - -	Verdict for defendant.	-	29 - -
7	Northwich	-	-	Goods sold and delivered	26 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	Wigan	-	-	-	-	-	3 - -	Slander - Damages	100 - -	Nonsuit	-	16 - -
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100 - -	-	-	No costs allowed.

		Goods sold and delivered	40 12 6																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																										</
--	--	--------------------------	---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----

Return of Causes sent from a Superior Court to be Tried in a County Court—continued.

Circuit.	Court Town.	Causes sent for Trial from Superior Courts under Section 26 of Act of 1856.		Causes sent from Superior Court under Section 7 of Act of 1867.				Actions of Tort remitted under Section 10 of Act of 1867.				
		Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Amount of Costs Allowed.		Nature of Action in each Case.	Amount of Damages.		Amount of Costs Allowed.	
						Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.		Claimed.	Awarded.	Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.
21	Birmingham	Goods sold	£. s. d. 27 6 6	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Hire of horse and damages	40 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	25 3 7	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Unliquidated damages	50 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	36 6 11	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	25 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	28 18 1	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		ditto	24 9 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		ditto	31 1 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		ditto	21 1 6	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
21	Birmingham	Goods sold and bill of exchange	9 2 6	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Money paid	23 2 9	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	47 15 11	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		ditto	49 10 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold and bill of exchange	35 7 3	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	50 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Interest in a certain invention for improvements in sewing machines, money paid, goods sold, goods bargained and sold, and for commission.	37 10 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	25 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		ditto	22 19 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Money paid	49 19 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
21	Tamworth	Goods sold	33 3 3	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Goods sold	40 19 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		ditto	25 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	23 12 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
22	Bromsgrove	Goods sold	21 10 9	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Money paid	40 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	40 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	23 8 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
22	Northampton	Goods sold	46 10 -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Money paid	50 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	145 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	150 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
23	Wellingborough	Goods sold	20 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Money paid	85 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
23	Ledbury	Goods sold	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Money paid	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
23	Worcester	Goods sold	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	{ - ditto	{ - ditto	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -
		Money paid	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Goods sold	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	
		Work done	29 - -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -			£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	£. s. d. -	

RETURN of Causes sent from a Superior Court to be Tried in a County Court—continued.

CIRCUIT.	Court Town.	Causes sent for Trial from Superior Courts under Section 26 of Act of 1856.		Causes sent from Superior Court under Section 7 of Act of 1867.		Actions of Tort remitted under Section 10 of Act of 1867.				
		Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Nature of Claim in each Case.	Amount of Claim.	Nature of Action in each Case.	Amount of Damages.		Amount of Costs Allowed.	
							Claimed.	Awarded.	Superior Court Scale.	County Court Scale.
42	Bloomsbury	Goods sold	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	Personal injury	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	—
		- ditto	39	-	-	False imprisonment	100	-	-	—
		Bill of exchange	32	-	-	Illegal distress	50	-	-	2 9 4
		Goods sold	11	-	-	False imprisonment	500	-	-	17 11 10
		Detinue	25	-	-	False imprisonment	1,000	-	-	7 13 4
		Money lent	41	-	-	Personal injury	300	-	-	14 19 2
		Commission	20	-	-	False imprisonment	800	-	-	6 4 6
		Detinue	15	-	-	False imprisonment	100	-	-	15 19 10
		Goods sold	49	-	-	Slander	500	-	-	13 4 2
		- ditto	41	-	-	False representation	100	-	-	—
43	Brentford	Medical attendance	47	-	-	Slander	100	-	-	11 - 2
		Bill of exchange	27	-	-	Personal injury	200	-	-	2 12 10
		Bill of exchange	38	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	- Not yet taxed.
		Goods sold	31	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	- ditto.
		Medical attendance	35	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	-
		Goods sold	21	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	-
		Medical attendance	23	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	-
		- ditto	55	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	-
		Damages for breach of contract	50	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	-
		- ditto	49	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	-
43	Brompton	Goods sold	26 10 9	-	-	Damages for injuries received through defendant's negligence.	200	-	-	Agreed costs, 20%.
		Bill of exchange	20 5 2	-	-	False imprisonment	100	-	-	5 7 -
		Commission	40	-	-	Value of goods detained	50	-	-	6 14 6
		Goods sold	35 17 -	-	-	Trespass and wrongful conversion.	500	-	-	9 3 6
		- ditto	40 14 6	-	-	- ditto	500	-	-	16 6 8
		Goods sold and delivered	48 7 10	-	-	Negligent driving	200	-	-	6 4 8
		- ditto	24 5 -	-	-	- ditto	300	-	-	18 2 8
		- ditto	27 3 7	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	Settled.
		- ditto	20 12 7	-	-	- ditto	200	-	-	Waived.
		- ditto	26 15 -	-	-	Illegal seizure of goods	82 10	-	-	No taxation had.
43	Marylebone	Money lent	14 6 2	-	-	Illegal and excessive distress.	100	-	-	6 16 6
		- ditto	14 16 6	-	-	Trespass and trover	500	-	-	9 1 8
		Work and materials	30	-	-	Delation of character	30	-	-	2 5 -
		Work and labour	24 2 -	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	3 17 -
		Money lent and interest	46 13 9	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	-
		- ditto	34	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	-
		Bill of exchange	40	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	-
		- ditto	50	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	-
		Promissory note	24	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	-
		- ditto	24	-	-	- ditto	30	-	-	-

[illegible]

RETURN of Causes sent from a Superior Court to be Tried in a County Court—continued.

[illegible]

[illegible]

RETURN of Causes sent from a Superior Court to be Tried in a County Court—continued.

[illegible]

SUMMARY of CASES under Sections 2, 11, and 12 of the COUNTY COURTS ACT, 1867.

LONDON

CIRCUITS.	Summonses Issued under Section 2, C. C. A., 1867.		No. of Plaints Entered under Sections 11 & 12 of Act of 1867.				CIRCUITS.	Summonses Issued under Section 2, C. C. A., 1867.		No. of Plaints Entered under Sections 11 & 12 of Act of 1867.			
	No. to be Served otherwise than by Bailiff of Court.	No. to be Served by Bailiff.	No. under Sec. 11.	No. under Sec. 12.	Costs, Exclusive of Fees.	Fees.		No. to be Served otherwise than by Bailiff of Court.	No. to be Served by Bailiff.	No. under Sec. 11.	No. under Sec. 12.	Costs, Exclusive of Fees.	Fees.
Circuit 1	11	319	1	-	£.	£.	Circuit 32	16	448	4	1	80	24
" 2	7	267	3	-	23	10	" 33	3	341	3	1	51	25
" 3	17	161	2	12	71	54	" 35	9	270	8	6	40	34
" 4	146	443	-	4	39	14	" 36	10	177	3	2	58	12
" 5	3	247	-	-	-	-	" 37	8	225	-	2	20	7
" 6	26	1,089	1	-	-	4	" 38	15	246	1	1	-	2
" 7	3	204	5	2	48	25	" 39	186	744	1	-	21	4
" 8	2	486	-	-	-	-	" 40	190	1,313	2	-	15	6
" 9	2	161	3	2	56	18	" 41	119	635	-	-	-	-
" 11	338	937	2	3	18	22	" 42	179	602	-	-	-	-
" 12	224	1,069	2	-	15	4	" 43	103	203	-	-	-	-
" 13	371	656	-	-	-	-	" 44	86	328	-	-	-	-
" 14	274	2,550	-	-	-	-	" 45	29	434	3	-	22	6
" 15	21	630	-	1	10	6	" 46	275	1,666	-	-	-	-
" 16	11	1,085	1	2	22	10	" 47	62	303	3	-	25	8
" 17	17	285	4	3	42	24	" 48	41	207	2	-	24	2
" 18	154	539	1	1	16	6	" 49	4	174	-	-	-	-
" 19	19	338	3	3	26	28	" 50	5	207	2	-	2	3
" 20	13	1,292	3	6	47	19	" 51	2	257	5	3	99	24
" 21	705	3,042	1	1	2	6	" 52	20	331	3	1	52	14
" 22	33	743	2	3	11	15	" 53	-	394	3	2	70	14
" 23	153	582	5	-	8	16	" 54	74	2,716	7	-	35	21
" 24	41	296	7	-	48	25	" 55	1	165	3	1	1	7
" 25	269	1,360	5	-	17	13	" 57	6	575	4	12	122	47
" 26	34	473	1	3	21	10	" 58	66	584	4	1	4	13
" 27	19	728	7	1	41	24	" 59	-	126	6	2	42	33
" 28	1	194	2	4	23	20	TOTALS -	4,414	34,512	151	89	1,498	737
" 29	7	371	3	-	44	14	CITY OF LONDON COURT	138	2,059	-	-	-	-
" 30	5	184	15	1	11	25							
" 31	9	170	5	2	56	16							

Note.—In many cases the costs have not been taxed, so that the total does not represent the true amount.

SUMMARY.

CIRCUITS.	ABSCONDING DEBTORS.				CHARITABLE TRUSTS ACTS, 16 & 17 Vict. c. 137, s. 32.		DESERTED WIVES PROTECTION ORDERS, 20 & 21 Vict. c. 35.	
	Warrants to Arrest.	Bail Given.	Debts and Costs Paid.	Warrant Suspended.	Matters Heard.	Orders Made.	Registered.	Discharged.
Circuit 1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
" 2 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-
" 3 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
" 4 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	54	-
" 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	-
" 6 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	-
" 7 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
" 8 - -	2	-	2	-	-	-	63	-
" 9 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-
" 11 - -	-	-	-	-	1	-	36	-
" 12 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-
" 13 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	-
" 14 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-
" 15 - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
" 16 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
" 17 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-
" 18 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
" 19 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
" 20 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
" 21 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
" 22 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
" 23 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
" 24 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
" 25 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
" 26 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	32	-
" 27 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
" 28 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
" 29 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
" 30 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
" 31 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
" 32 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
" 33 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
" 35 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-
" 36 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-
" 37 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
" 38 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
" 39 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-
" 40 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	-
" 41 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	-
" 42 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	24	-
" 43 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	-
" 44 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-
" 45 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-
" 46 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-
" 47 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	-
" 48 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-
" 49 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
" 50 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-
" 51 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
" 52 - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
" 53 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-
" 54 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
" 55 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-
" 57 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
" 58 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-
" 59 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
TOTALS - -	4	-	2	-	1	-	831	-

COUNTY COURTS.

RETURN from every COUNTY COURT in *England* and *Wales* of the Total Number of PLAINTS, &c. entered in each Court from 1 January to 31 December 1874, both Days inclusive; distinguishing those not exceeding £.20; those above £.20; and not exceeding £.50; and those by Agreement above £.50 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 117, of Session 1874).

(*Mr. Norwood.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
9 April 1875.

[*Price 7 d.*]

138.

Under 6 oz.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 11 March 1875;—for,

“RETURN from every COUNTY COURT of the Particulars mentioned in the
STATEMENT annexed, for the Year ending the 31st day of December
1874; with the Names of the Judges attached to each Court:—

STATEMENT.

Number of Complaints Entered in 1874;
Number Entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.;
Number Entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.;
Number Entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.;
Number Entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.;
Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874;
Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made
exceeded 40 s.;
Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was
made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.;
Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was
made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.;
Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was
made did not exceed 1 s.;
Number of Days during which each Person Imprisoned lay in Prison.” [See Note
at page 18.]

(Mr. Bass.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
2 August 1875.

RETURN from every COUNTY COURT in *England* and *Wales* of the undermentioned Particulars for the Year ended the 31st day of December 1874.

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5s. and not exceeding 40s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1s. and not exceeding 5s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5s. and did not exceed 40s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1s. and did not exceed 5s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which default was made did not exceed 1s.
CIRCUIT No. 1.										
Alnwick - - - -	211	99	104	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belford - - - -	16	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellingham - - -	33	19	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Berwick - - - -	118	78	35	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gateshead - - - -	1,836	608	1,148	80	0	22	16	6	0	0
Hexham - - - -	198	103	87	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morpeth - - - -	531	260	254	17	0	5	4	1	0	0
Newcastle - - - -	4,449	2,274	2,022	153	0	19	8	11	0	0
North Shields - -	1,714	622	1,042	50	0	7	1	6	0	0
Rothbury - - - -	55	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wooler - - - -	57	33	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	9,218	4,138	4,758	322	0	54	30	24	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 2.										
Bishop Auckland -	2,092	842	1,173	76	1	11	10	1	0	0
Durham - - - -	3,340	1,095	2,119	125	1	12	10	2	0	0
Hartlepool - - -	1,919	766	1,064	89	0	2	1	1	0	0
Seaham Harbour -	915	211	618	86	0	3	2	1	0	0
Shotley Bridge - -	1,217	475	658	83	1	6	3	3	0	0
South Shields - -	2,749	875	1,738	133	3	12	8	4	0	0
Sunderland - - -	4,711	1,888	2,608	215	0	23	8	15	0	0
Wolsingham - - -	243	98	141	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	17,186	6,250	10,119	811	6	69	42	27	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 3.										
Alston - - - -	53	22	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ambleside - - - -	359	154	177	28	0	3	3	0	0	0
Appleby - - - -	193	109	79	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brampton - - - -	278	129	142	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carlisle - - - -	1,186	572	573	41	0	8	2	6	0	0
Cockermouth - - -	1,289	477	727	84	1	8	6	2	0	0
Haltwhistle - - -	81	34	44	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Keswick - - - -	138	47	61	27	3	0	0	0	0	0
Kirkby Kendal - -	1,094	393	605	96	0	16	8	8	0	0
Kirkby Lonsdale -	218	114	101	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Penrith - - - -	715	361	327	27	0	1	1	0	0	0
Settle - - - -	96	41	52	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ulverston and Barrow-in-Furness.	3,034	1,338	1,518	177	1	173	99	74	0	0
Whitehaven - - -	2,294	817	1,266	211	0	17	12	5	0	0
Wigton - - - -	619	189	384	44	2	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	11,647	4,797	6,087	756	7	227	131	96	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 4.										
Bacup - - - -	1,437	573	814	50	0	4	3	1	0	0
Blackburn - - - -	4,149	1,836	2,098	212	3	26	12	14	0	0
Chorley - - - -	979	401	510	67	1	2	1	1	0	0
Garstang - - - -	99	50	46	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haslingden and Accrington	1,116	519	556	41	0	5	2	3	0	0
Kirkham - - - -	149	63	73	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lancaster - - - -	538	244	266	27	1	2	2	0	0	0
Poulton-le-Fylde - - -	496	268	219	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preston - - - -	2,239	978	1,167	92	2	8	2	6	0	0
TOTALS - - -	11,202	4,932	5,749	514	7	47	22	25	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 5.										
Bolton - - - -	7,905	2,501	4,872	525	7	21	11	10		0
Bury - - - -	2,639	884	1,597	155	3	33	19	14		0
Oldham - - - -	3,370	1,067	2,052	244	7	7	3	4		0
Rochdale - - - -	2,366	822	1,366	172	6	8	3	5	0	0
TOTALS - - -	16,280	5,274	9,887	1,096	23	69	36	33	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 6.										
Liverpool - - - -	22,981	8,782	13,045	1,140	14	79	39	40	0	0
Ormskirk - - - -	970	482	460	28	0	8	4	4	0	0
St. Helen's - - - -	4,205	1,429	2,502	270	4	24	10	14	0	0
TOTALS - - -	28,156	10,693	16,007	1,438	18	111	53	58	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 7.										
Altrincham - - - -	1,557	517	845	191	4	14	7	6	1	0
Birkenhead - - - -	5,961	1,617	3,558	781	5	50	22	27	1	0
Leigh - - - -	1,984	647	1,189	147	1	49	20	29	0	0
Northwich - - - -	2,125	662	1,267	192	4	16	8	8	0	0
Runcorn - - - -	1,378	491	788	99	0	17	6	11	0	0
Warrington - - - -	4,364	1,275	2,747	340	2	81	32	49	0	0
Wigan - - - -	6,035	2,662	2,964	404	5	196	117	79	0	0
TOTALS - - -	23,404	7,871	13,358	2,154	21	423	212	209	2	0

RETURN RELATING TO COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 8.										
Manchester - - -	14,570	4,543	9,115	894	18	33	15	18	0	0
Salford - - - -	10,291	2,410	7,121	754	6	43	15	25	3	0
TOTALS - - -	24,861	6,953	16,236	1,648	24	76	30	43	3	0
CIRCUIT No. 9.										
Ashton-under-Lyne - -	4,728	1,451	2,856	408	13	79	33	46	0	0
Congleton and Sandbach -	1,549	498	941	168	2	5	0	4	1	0
Hyde - - - -	1,892	584	1,139	160	9	27	7	19	1	0
Macclesfield - - -	1,975	555	1,238	178	4	20	10	10	0	0
Nantwich and Crewe -	1,655	441	1,048	162	4	5	4	1	0	0
Stockport - - -	3,589	1,142	2,145	287	15	19	7	11	1	0
Whitechurch - - -	487	187	269	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	15,875	4,798	9,636	1,394	47	155	61	91	3	0
CIRCUIT No. 11.										
Bradford - - - -	8,087	3,602	4,176	307	2	12	10	2	0	0
Burnley - - - -	1,785	786	926	71	2	7	2	5	0	0
Clitheroe - - - -	295	120	149	26	0	1	0	1	0	0
Colne - - - -	303	164	130	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Keighley - - - -	878	396	451	31	0	1	1	0	0	0
Otley - - - -	911	400	435	75	1	2	2	0	0	0
Skipton - - - -	411	210	194	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Todmorden - - - -	632	286	306	37	3	4	2	2	0	0
TOTALS - - -	13,302	5,964	6,767	503	8	27	17	10	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 12.										
Dewsbury - - - -	7,751	2,395	4,763	591	2	52	27	25	0	0
Halifax - - - -	8,111	997	6,699	414	1	32	8	24	0	0
Holmfirth - - - -	640	253	350	35	2	6	4	2	0	0
Huddersfield - - -	5,046	1,979	2,838	227	2	28	21	7	0	0
Pontefract - - -	3,127	1,074	1,813	240	0	32	13	19	0	0
Saddleworth - - -	341	138	185	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	25,016	6,836	16,648	1,525	7	150	73	77	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 13.										
Glossop - - - -	623	184	386	52	1	0	0	0	0	0
Rotherham - - - -	3,594	1,116	2,292	183	3	9	3	6	0	0
Sheffield - - - -	21,719	6,429	13,804	1,471	15	30	24	6	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	25,936	7,729	16,482	1,706	19	39	27	12	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 14.										
Barnsley - - - -	5,079	1,751	2,959	365	4	12	6	6	0	0
Goole - - - -	751	268	420	62	1	1	1	0	0	0
Leeds - - - -	20,046	7,248	11,717	1,066	15	136	86	50	0	0
Wakefield - - - -	3,949	1,328	2,348	272	1	30	20	10	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	29,825	10,595	17,444	1,765	21	179	113	66	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 15.										
Barnard Castle - -	390	173	204	13	0	2	2	0	0	0
Darlington - - - -	2,697	721	1,697	277	2	9	6	3	0	0
Easingwold - - - -	130	69	58	3	0	1	1	0	0	0
Helmsley - - - -	183	95	85	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Knaresborough - -	970	383	546	41	0	2	2	0	0	0
Leyburn - - - -	135	72	61	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northallerton - - -	429	183	219	23	4	1	1	0	0	0
Richmond - - - -	355	180	163	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ripon - - - -	613	279	314	20	0	2	1	1	0	0
Stockton-on-Tees and Mid-	6,034	2,237	3,452	344	1	38	20	18	0	0
dlesborough.										
Stokesley - - - -	970	389	520	56	5	3	3	0	0	0
Tadcaster - - - -	399	141	228	30	0	2	2	0	0	0
Thirsk - - - -	228	112	110	6	0	1	1	0	0	0
York - - - -	1,799	976	729	90	4	4	4	0	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	15,332	6,010	8,386	920	16	65	43	22	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 16.										
Beverley - - - -	402	161	224	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bridlington - - - -	281	144	131	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Great Driffield - -	383	166	191	26	0	1	0	1	0	0
Hedon - - - -	119	58	55	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Howden - - - -	362	156	194	11	1	3	2	1	0	0
Kingston-upon-Hull -	7,337	2,648	4,158	524	7	9	4	5	0	0
New Malton - - - -	802	342	423	35	2	9	4	4	1	0
Pecklington - - - -	265	110	144	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scarborough - - - -	1,137	453	581	100	3	0	0	0	0	0
Selby - - - -	601	211	342	47	1	1	0	1	0	0
Whitby - - - -	600	213	338	48	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	12,289	4,662	6,781	831	15	23	10	12	1	0

RETURN RELATING TO COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

COURT TOWN.	PLAINTS.					IMPRISONMENTS.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 17.										
Barton-on-Humber - -	333	120	196	15	2	1	1	0	0	0
Boston - - - -	1,583	636	825	118	4	19	11	7	1	0
Brigg - - - -	550	223	301	24	2	1	1	0	0	0
Caistor - - - -	271	78	161	32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gainsborough - - -	1,174	425	633	115	1	0	0	0	0	0
Great Grimsby - -	1,811	675	1,018	117	1	9	7	2	0	0
Holbeach - - - -	703	271	378	53	1	1	1	0	0	0
Horncastle - - - -	537	142	346	48	1	1	0	1	0	0
Lincoln - - - -	2,126	406	1,630	90	0	8	6	2	0	0
Louth - - - -	569	241	298	30	0	2	1	1	0	0
Market Rasen - - -	283	122	151	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sleaford - - - -	543	197	290	56	0	1	1	0	0	0
Spalding - - - -	865	326	408	102	29	3	2	1	0	0
Spilsby - - - -	528	184	315	28	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	11,876	4,046	6,950	838	42	46	31	14	1	0
CIRCUIT No. 18.										
Bingham - - - -	184	62	101	20	1	2	0	2	0	0
Doncaster - - - -	1,910	785	1,065	60	0	13	7	6	0	0
East Retford - - -	935	361	509	64	1	3	2	1	0	0
Mansfield - - - -	868	240	575	50	3	1	0	1	0	0
Newark - - - -	1,793	639	981	173	0	6	3	3	0	0
Nottingham - - - -	10,872	3,580	6,750	535	7	89	40	49	0	0
Thorne - - - -	505	178	303	23	1	2	1	1	0	0
Worksop - - - -	1,319	331	861	124	3	6	4	2	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	18,386	6,176	11,145	1,049	16	122	57	65	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 19.										
Alfreton - - - -	3,172	944	1,985	240	3	17	6	11	0	0
Ashbourne - - - -	487	168	289	30	0	3	1	2	0	0
Bakewell - - - -	439	200	227	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belper and Ilkeston -	2,652	733	1,683	219	17	17	9	8	0	0
Burton-on-Trent - -	3,336	882	2,114	338	2	34	15	19	0	0
Chapel-en-le-Frith and Buxton.	565	233	310	20	2	6	4	2	0	0
Chesterfield - - -	4,128	1,308	2,579	241	0	29	18	11	0	0
Derby - - - -	6,071	1,556	3,979	525	11	106	25	81	0	0
Wirksworth - - - -	686	236	402	48	0	6	6	0	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	21,536	6,260	13,568	1,673	35	218	84	134	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 20.										
Ashby-de-la-Zouch - -	2,494	649	1,625	219	1	19	7	12	0	0
Bourn - - - -	831	242	518	71	0	6	2	4	0	0
Grantham - - -	2,218	587	1,434	193	4	25	3	22	0	0
Hinckley - - -	622	167	440	15	0	7	6	1	0	0
Leicester - - -	9,366	3,055	5,693	614	4	99	25	74	0	0
Loughborough - -	2,637	671	1,660	300	6	17	5	12	0	0
Lutterworth - - -	403	130	245	28	0	3	2	1	0	0
Market Bosworth - -	779	201	488	90	0	14	5	9	0	0
Market Harborough -	525	195	297	33	0	1	1	0	0	0
Melton Mowbray - -	749	230	480	37	2	7	3	4	0	0
Nuneaton - - - -	705	191	450	64	0	11	6	5	0	0
Oakham - - - -	477	122	316	37	2	3	1	2	0	0
Stamford - - - -	1,069	338	640	89	2	6	4	2	0	0
Uppingham - - -	287	95	161	30	1	3	3	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	23,162	6,873	14,447	1,820	22	221	73	148	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 21.										
Atherstone - - -	450	155	267	27	1	2	1	1	0	0
Birmingham - - -	34,021	13,305	19,079	1,632	5	162	63	96	3	0
Tamworth - - - -	669	195	430	43	1	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	35,140	13,655	19,776	1,702	7	165	64	98	3	0
CIRCUIT No. 22.										
Alcester - - - -	527	119	379	28	1	2	0	2	0	0
Bromsgrove - - -	676	188	435	53	0	3	1	2	0	0
Coventry - - - -	1,955	41	1,093	821	0	40	10	30	0	0
Daventry - - - -	456	131	285	39	1	0	0	0	0	0
Evesham - - - -	652	204	384	64	0	2	1	1	0	0
Kettering - - - -	1,012	436	515	61	0	5	2	3	0	0
Northampton - - -	3,537	1,067	2,285	185	0	11	6	5	0	0
Pershore - - - -	408	112	255	39	2	2	2	0	0	0
Redditch - - - -	1,295	321	863	108	3	0	0	0	0	0
Rugby - - - -	1,027	297	665	65	0	5	1	4	0	0
Solihull - - - -	394	157	226	11	0	1	1	0	0	0
Southam - - - -	345	76	238	31	0	1	0	1	0	0
Stratford-on-Avon - -	478	159	288	30	1	2	0	2	0	0
Towcester - - - -	617	144	414	59	0	2	0	2	0	0
Wellingborough - -	934	265	618	51	0	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	14,313	3,717	8,943	1,645	8	77	24	53	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 23.										
Bromyard - - -	262	103	144	15	0	1	0	1	0	0
Droitwich - - -	413	131	247	35	0	2	1	1	0	0
Dudley - - -	7,219	1,858	4,744	605	12	30	1	29	0	0
Great Malvern - - -	826	271	488	65	2	2	1	1	0	0
Kidderminster - - -	2,000	560	1,246	188	6	12	2	10	0	0
Ledbury - - -	531	153	341	36	1	1	1	0	0	0
Stourbridge - - -	4,834	1,149	3,204	474	7	16	6	10	0	0
Tenbury - - -	359	159	183	17	0	1	0	1	0	0
Worcester - - -	3,250	1,131	1,891	222	6	13	3	10	0	0
TOTALS - - -	19,694	5,515	12,488	1,657	34	78	15	63	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 24.										
Abergavenny - - -	974	362	570	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cardiff - - -	4,085	1,202	2,024	859	0	4	1	3	0	0
Chepstow - - -	643	262	334	46	1	1	0	1	0	0
Crickhowell - - -	276	119	137	20	0	1	1	0	0	0
Monmouth - - -	1,264	431	750	78	5	2	0	2	0	0
Newport (Monmouth) - -	2,927	1,269	1,535	123	0	1	1	0	0	0
Pontypool - - -	1,439	437	917	85	0	2	2	0	0	0
Ross - - -	622	238	333	51	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tredegar - - -	3,294	1,281	1,870	143	0	6	4	2	0	0
Usk - - -	341	153	175	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	15,865	5,754	8,645	1,460	6	17	9	8	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 25.										
Oldbury - - -	6,477	1,529	4,582	356	10	13	5	8	0	0
Walsall - - -	6,859	2,319	4,066	464	10	24	13	11	0	0
Wolverhampton - - -	8,734	3,413	4,833	482	6	46	12	34	0	0
TOTALS - - -	22,070	7,261	13,481	1,302	26	83	30	53	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 26.										
Cheadle - - -	387	130	223	34	0	1	0	1	0	0
Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall.	9,028	2,742	5,005	679	2	15	10	5	0	0
Leek - - -	950	285	615	49	1	0	0	0	0	0
Lichfield - - -	691	281	373	37	0	1	1	0	0	0
Market Drayton - - -	296	95	180	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newcastle-under-Lyme -	3,333	929	2,125	278	1	5	5	0	0	0
Rugeley - - -	304	121	170	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stafford - - -	1,113	449	597	65	2	1	0	1	0	0
Stoke-upon-Trent and Longton.	3,693	1,169	2,377	145	2	15	9	6	0	0
Stone - - -	498	171	294	33	0	1	1	0	0	0
Uttoxeter - - -	299	134	153	10	2	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	20,502	6,506	12,712	1,364	10	39	26	13	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1s. and not exceeding 5s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1s. and did not exceed 5s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1s.
CIRCUIT No. 27.										
Bishop's Castle - - -	299	120	163	17	0	5	3	2	0	0
Bridgnorth - - -	539	188	297	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cleobury Mortimer - -	347	125	206	15	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hereford - - -	2,052	882	1,073	93	4	15	11	4	0	0
Leominster - - -	945	280	574	90	1	4	4	0	0	0
Ludlow - - -	1,024	267	659	94	4	2	1	1	0	0
Madeley - - -	1,905	600	1,102	190	4	12	7	5	0	0
Newport (Salop) - -	765	278	429	57	1	2	1	1	0	0
Oswestry - - -	566	251	279	36	0	1	1	0	0	0
Shrewsbury - - -	1,621	710	782	121	8	6	4	2	0	0
Wellington (Salop) - -	1,143	367	676	99	1	14	9	5	0	0
Wem - - -	312	124	180	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	11,518	4,192	6,419	883	24	61	41	20	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 28.										
Aberystwith - - -	1,208	619	540	49	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bala - - -	136	42	85	9	0	1	1	0	0	0
Builth - - -	125	56	65	4	0	1	1	0	0	0
Corwen - - -	222	91	121	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dolgelly - - -	244	118	111	15	0	1	0	1	0	0
Hay - - -	417	144	239	33	1	0	0	0	0	0
Kington - - -	201	72	110	19	0	1	0	1	0	0
Knighton - - -	481	172	282	27	0	1	1	0	0	0
Llanfyllin - - -	239	89	140	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Llanidloes - - -	226	68	140	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Machynlleth - - -	311	167	135	7	2	1	1	0	0	0
Newtown - - -	465	163	275	27	0	1	1	0	0	0
Portmadoc - - -	721	286	397	38	0	3	2	1	0	0
Presteigne - - -	124	31	82	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pwllheli - - -	361	158	181	19	3	0	0	0	0	0
Rhayader - - -	107	43	60	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Welchpool - - -	820	328	448	44	0	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	6,408	2,647	3,411	344	6	11	7	4	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 29.										
Bangor - - -	1,016	378	534	104	0	4	1	3	0	0
Carnarvon - - -	1,995	704	1,159	130	2	12	7	5	0	0
Chester - - -	2,733	1,146	1,414	172	1	14	8	6	0	0
Conway - - -	299	151	135	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denbigh - - -	468	185	250	33	0	1	1	0	0	0
Holywell - - -	552	264	256	32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Llangefni and Holyhead -	811	330	441	40	0		1	0	0	0
Llanrwst - - -	310	124	166	20	0	1	0	1	0	0
Mold and Flint - - -	1,066	423	568	71	4	10	7	3	0	0
Ruthin - - -	420	132	244	40	4	0	0	0	0	0
St. Asaph and Rhyl - -	609	223	319	66	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wrexham and Llangollen -	2,511	1,059	1,244	109	9	11	5	6	0	0
TOTALS - - -	12,790	5,119	6,730	920	21	54	30	24	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 30.										
Aberdare - - -	3,087	1,242	1,707	138	0	8	3	5	0	0
Brecknock - - -	657	256	348	53	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bridgend and Cowbridge -	1,281	545	681	54	1	3	1	2	0	0
Merthyr-Tydfil - - -	3,483	1,161	2,086	225	11	38	11	27	0	0
Pontypridd - - -	3,007	1,260	1,593	154	0	27	13	14	0	0
Swansea - - -	5,298	2,139	2,889	267	3	31	16	15	0	0
TOTALS - - -	16,813	6,603	9,304	891	15	107	44	63	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 31.										
Aberayron - - -	265	122	127	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cardigan - - -	310	146	149	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carmarthen - - -	806	302	417	87	0	3	1	2	0	0
Haverfordwest - - -	747	334	364	49	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lampeter - - -	561	241	287	33	0	1	1	0	0	0
Llandilofawr - - -	418	190	74	154	0	0	0	0	0	0
Llandovery - - -	330	159	159	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Llanelly - - -	1,104	452	607	45	0	1	1	0	0	0
Narberth - - -	733	203	408	119	3	0	0	0	0	0
Neath - - -	2,945	964	1,793	168	0	5	2	3	0	0
Newcastle-in-Emlyn -	271	91	138	40	2	0	0	0	0	0
Pembroke Dock - - -	679	234	381	61	3	1	1	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	9,169	3,438	4,904	819	8	11	6	5	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 32.										
Attleborough - - -	241	102	130	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aylsham - - -	249	79	136	32	2	1	1	0	0	0
Downham Market - - -	275	101	148	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Dereham - - -	398	148	212	35	3	0	0	0	0	0
Ely - - -	683	252	381	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holt - - -	173	58	95	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
King's Lynn - - -	1,182	414	641	122	5	1	1	0	0	0
Little Walsingham - -	455	118	291	46	0	1	0	1	0	0
North Walsham - - -	237	101	113	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norwich - - -	3,179	1,159	1,893	119	8	8	6	2	0	0
Soham - - -	140	46	87	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swaffham - - -	233	81	139	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thetford - - -	274	98	142	34	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wymondham - - -	147	81	64	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	7,866	2,838	4,472	538	18	11	8	3	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 33.										
Beccles and Bungay - -	488	148	292	46	2	1	1	0	0	0
Bury St. Edmunds - - -	1,445	497	831	115	2	1	1	0	0	0
Diss and Eye - - -	470	195	253	22	0	3	2	1	0	0
Framlingham and Saxmundham.	431	161	241	29	0	6	3	3	0	0
Great Yarmouth - - -	2,089	970	958	158	3	4	2	2	0	0
Halesworth - - -	409	160	219	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harleston - - -	396	149	215	32	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ipswich - - -	3,207	949	1,981	275	2	13	6	7	0	0
Lowestoft - - -	815	390	358	64	3	3	1	2	0	0
Mildenhall - - -	230	81	133	16	0	1	0	1	0	0
Stowmarket - - -	670	215	372	81	2	0	0	0	0	0
Woodbridge - - -	358	131	179	46	2	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	11,008	4,046	6,032	914	16	33	16	17	0	0

RETURN RELATING TO COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

11

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 35.										
Ampthill - - - -	567	105	408	53	1	2	1	1	0	0
Bedford - - - -	1,468	462	854	151	1	2	2	0	0	0
Biggleswade - - -	701	171	453	77	0	2	0	2	0	0
Bishop's Stortford - -	665	281	349	34	1	2	0	2	0	0
Cambridge - - - -	2,356	806	1,329	130	1	2	2	0	0	0
Haverhill - - - -	412	105	253	48	6	0	0	0	0	0
Huntingdon - - - -	1,208	353	733	118	4	3	0	3	0	0
March - - - -	477	170	259	48	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newmarket - - - -	397	131	245	20	1	0	0	0	0	0
Oundle - - - -	661	145	459	55	2	1	0	1	0	0
Peterborough - - -	2,052	556	1,232	258	6	6	4	2	0	0
Royston - - - -	557	174	345	37	1	3	3	0	0	0
Saffron Walden - - -	405	118	240	46	1	0	0	0	0	0
St. Neots - - - -	424	111	265	45	3	1	1	0	0	0
Thrapston - - - -	544	121	378	43	2	2	0	2	0	0
Wisbech - - - -	984	352	534	95	3	1	1	0	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	13,878	4,251	8,336	1,258	33	27	14	13	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 36.										
Abingdon - - - -	613	153	377	76	7	2	1	1	0	0
Banbury - - - -	1,168	391	694	83	0	2	0	2	0	0
Bicester - - - -	472	135	305	32	0	2	0	2	0	0
Brackley - - - -	395	103	265	27	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buckingham - - - -	669	246	372	51	0	2	1	1	0	0
Chipping Norton - - -	310	116	171	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faringdon - - - -	310	120	175	15	0	1	0	1	0	0
Oxford - - - -	1,811	925	805	81	0	9	4	5	0	0
Shipston-on-Stour - - -	636	191	397	48	0	2	1	1	0	0
Stow-on-the-Wold - - -	261	99	152	10	0	2	2	0	0	0
Thame - - - -	461	131	289	39	2	0	0	0	0	0
Wantage - - - -	321	113	185	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Warwick - - - -	2,101	758	515	828	0	4	3	1	0	0
Witney - - - -	470	189	262	19	0	1	0	1	0	0
Woodstock - - - -	339	86	219	34	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	10,337	3,756	5,183	1,389	9	27	12	15	0	0

RETURN RELATING TO COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 37.										
Aylesbury - - -	847	287	487	72	1	4	1	3	0	0
Barnet - - - -	764	337	373	53	1	6	4	2	0	0
Chesham - - - -	562	173	342	47	0	5	1	4	0	0
Henley-on-Thames - -	271	82	157	32	0	3	1	2	0	0
High Wycombe - - -	955	405	461	87	2	3	2	1	0	0
Leighton Buzzard - -	1,164	356	648	160	0	3	1	2	0	0
Luton - - - - -	1,458	541	809	108	0	12	5	7	0	0
Newport Pagnell - -	976	268	639	68	1	6	3	3	0	0
Saint Albans - - - -	1,173	331	731	109	2	5	4	1	0	0
Uxbridge - - - - -	1,172	438	629	105	0	18	9	9	0	0
Wallingford - - - -	437	144	227	58	8	1	0	1	0	0
Watford - - - - -	907	449	395	62	1	4	4	0	0	0
Windsor - - - - -	1,926	846	946	132	2	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	12,612	4,657	6,844	1,093	18	71	35	36	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 38.										
Braintree - - - -	632	138	434	60	0	5	2	3	0	0
Brentwood - - - -	515	159	317	39	0	1	0	1	0	0
Chelmsford - - - -	735	282	391	62	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colchester - - - -	1,689	650	918	119	2	11	4	7	0	0
Dunmow - - - - -	299	89	186	23	1	0	0	0	0	0
Edmonton - - - - -	1,604	577	888	138	1	14	11	3	0	0
Hadleigh - - - - -	417	112	269	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
Halstead - - - - -	378	113	231	34	0	2	0	2	0	0
Harwich - - - - -	511	134	311	66	0	4	2	2	0	0
Hertford - - - - -	753	244	438	70	1	12	0	12	0	0
Hitchin - - - - -	603	198	360	44	1	6	3	3	0	0
Maldon - - - - -	532	211	286	35	0	2	1	1	0	0
Rochford - - - - -	572	191	342	39	0	3	2	1	0	0
Romford - - - - -	1,011	173	653	185	0	2	2	0	0	0
Sudbury - - - - -	607	180	374	53	0	3	0	2	1	0
Waltham Abbey - - -	1,048	310	602	76	0	6	1	5	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	11,906	3,761	7,060	1,079	6	71	28	42	1	0
CIRCUIT No. 39.										
Whitechapel - - - -	9,361	3,220	5,584	544	13	29	5	24	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 40.										
Bow - - - -	7,880	2,360	5,028	483	9	37	14	23	0	0
Shoreditch - - -	10,104	3,633	5,818	630	23	18	10	8	0	0
TOTALS - - -	17,984	5,993	10,846	1,113	32	55	24	31	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 41.										
Clerkenwell - - -	13,653	5,768	7,151	724	10	60	26	32	2	0
CIRCUIT No. 42.										
Bloomsbury - - -	10,734	5,522	4,788	415	9	31	24	7	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 43.										
Brentford - - -	2,161	1,006	1,024	131	0	14	12	2	0	0
Brompton - - -	6,585	3,130	3,084	364	7	69	47	21	1	0
Marylebone - - -	7,684	3,633	3,667	324	10	67	57	10	0	0
TOTALS - - -	16,430	7,819	7,775	819	17	150	116	33	1	0
CIRCUIT No. 44.										
Westminster - - -	12,315	7,391	4,516	394	14	55	43	11	1	0
CIRCUIT No. 45.										
Chertsey - - - -	982	391	498	64	29	6	5	1	0	0
Croydon - - - -	2,392	1,144	1,115	131	2	10	7	3	0	0
Epsom - - - -	741	322	375	44	0	2	2	0	0	0
Farnham and Aldershot -	1,014	499	481	34	0	6	3	3	0	0
Guildford and Godalming -	917	394	482	41	0	5	2	3	0	0
Hungerford - - -	294	112	161	20	1	2	1	1	0	0
Kingston-on-Thames -	1,755	765	880	85	25	15	10	5	0	0
Newbury - - - -	804	334	423	47	0	7	3	4	0	0
Reading - - - -	2,027	797	1,062	104	4	5	4	1	0	0
Wandsworth - - -	4,064	1,593	2,170	274	27	17	11	6	0	0
TOTALS - - -	14,900	6,351	7,647	904	88	75	48	27	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 46.										
Southwark - - - -	12,712	5,676	6,366	651	19	39	17	22	0	0

RETURN RELATING TO COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

COURT TOWN.	PLAINTS.					IMPRISONMENTS.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 47.										
Greenwich - - -	3,743	1,554	2,000	186	3	41	21	18	2	0
Lambeth - - -	8,070	2,945	4,721	397	7	54	38	16	0	0
Woolwich - - -	2,001	546	1,235	220	0	30	13	15	2	0
TOTALS - - -	13,814	5,045	7,956	803	10	125	72	49	4	0
CIRCUIT No. 48.										
Bromley - - -	592	265	291	34	2	0	0	0	0	0
Dartford - - -	988	282	616	88	2	7	1	6	0	0
Gravesend - - -	2,363	714	1,418	231	0	18	5	13	0	0
Maidstone - - -	2,094	709	1,179	206	0	14	2	12	0	0
Rochester - - -	4,978	1,186	3,315	472	5	79	14	65	0	0
Sevenoaks - - -	360	147	185	26	2	0	0	0	0	0
Sheerness - - -	943	182	660	96	5	4	0	4	0	0
Tonbridge - - -	412	174	210	28	0	2	2	0	0	0
Tonbridge Wells - -	1,271	578	573	118	2	2	1	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	14,001	4,237	8,447	1,299	18	126	25	101	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 49.										
Ashford - - -	623	196	347	79	1	0	0	0	0	0
Canterbury - - -	1,222	479	653	90	0	4	3	1	0	0
Deal - - -	282	100	159	21	2	0	0	0	0	0
Dover - - -	641	552	344	43	2	3	2	1	0	0
Faversham - - -	583	164	351	66	2	5	1	4	0	0
Folkestone - - -	615	203	377	34	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hythe - - -	189	64	114	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
Margate - - -	754	339	366	46	3	1	1	0	0	0
Ramsgate - - -	668	312	317	39	0	4	1	3	0	0
Romney - - -	76	34	35	6	1	5	2	3	0	0
Sandwich - - -	344	112	205	26	1	1	1	0	0	0
Sittingbourne - - -	993	296	611	84	2	15	5	10	0	0
Tenterden and Cranbrook -	252	95	132	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	7,242	2,646	4,011	570	15	38	16	22	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 50.										
Arundel - - -	509	159	299	49	2	1	0	1	0	0
Brighton - - -	6,097	2,684	2,994	403	16	24	8	16	0	0
Chichester - - -	851	304	471	72	4	2	2	0	0	0
Cuckfield - - -	333	145	166	22	0	3	2	1	0	0
Dorking - - -	212	82	115	14	1	0	0	0	0	0
East Grinstead - - -	244	130	102	11	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hastings - - -	1,547	646	803	98	0	9	8	1	0	0
Horsham - - -	517	164	300	46	7	6	5	1	0	0
Lewes - - -	1,535	553	862	119	1	7	4	3	0	0
Midhurst - - -	109	51	52	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Petworth - - -	271	106	150	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reigate - - -	647	304	309	33	1	2	2	0	0	0
Rye - - -	121	63	52	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worthing - - -	399	126	219	50	4	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	13,392	5,517	6,894	944	37	55	31	24	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 51.										
Alton - - -	233	90	127	16	0	2	0	2	0	0
Basingstoke - - -	533	188	322	15	8	2	1	1	0	0
Bishop's Waltham - - -	190	72	109	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lymington - - -	366	130	209	27	0	1	1	0	0	0
Newport, and at Ryde - - -	2,075	928	1,048	98	1	8	2	6	0	0
Petersfield - - -	201	95	94	11	1	0	0	0	0	0
Portsmouth - - -	4,468	1,917	2,412	139	0	46	32	14	0	0
Romsey - - -	370	139	209	22	0	2	0	2	0	0
Southampton - - -	3,122	1,301	1,677	141	3	10	2	8	0	0
Winchester - - -	1,326	371	840	113	2	6	2	4	0	0
TOTALS - - -	12,884	5,231	7,047	591	15	77	40	37	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 52.										
Bath - - -	3,664	1,301	2,050	306	7	8	3	5	0	0
Bradford and Trowbridge - - -	828	332	420	75	1	2	1	1	0	0
Calne - - -	275	56	187	30	2	0	0	0	0	0
Chippenham - - -	527	187	297	42	1	1	0	1	0	0
Chipping Sodbury - - -	283	71	192	18	2	0	0	0	0	0
Devizes - - -	583	203	346	28	6	1	0	1	0	0
Frome - - -	1,308	429	748	126	5	3	2	1	0	0
Marlborough - - -	317	104	192	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
Melksham - - -	201	66	105	30	0	2	0	2	0	0
Swindon - - -	2,549	790	1,541	215	3	3	1	2	0	0
Temple Cloud - - -	402	139	238	24	1	2	2	0	0	0
Warminster - - -	415	144	241	28	2	3	1	2	0	0
Westbury - - -	176	58	100	17	1	3	2	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	11,528	3,880	6,657	960	31	28	12	16	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 53.										
Cheltenham - - -	2,983	1,100	1,617	254	12	5	0	5	0	0
Cirencester - - -	880	294	515	69	2	1	0	1	0	0
Dursley - - - -	611	218	325	68	0	2	1	1	0	0
Gloucester - - -	2,858	1,191	1,453	206	8	16	5	11	0	0
Malmesbury - - -	608	175	437	56	0	1	0	1	0	0
Newent - - - - -	535	167	333	34	1	2	0	2	0	0
Newnham - - - -	2,064	413	1,536	113	2	2	1	1	0	0
Northleach - - -	166	53	103	10	0	1	1	0	0	0
Stroud - - - - -	1,426	361	897	160	8	6	0	6	0	0
Tewkesbury - - -	598	192	358	47	1	1	1	0	0	0
Thornbury - - - -	286	64	187	32	3	3	0	3	0	0
Winchcomb - - - -	319	102	196	21	0	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	13,394	4,330	7,957	1,070	37	41	9	32	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 54.										
Axbridge - - - -	560	163	344	52	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bristol - - - - -	15,075	6,100	8,120	832	23	94	55	39	0	0
Wells - - - - -	1,411	372	929	108	2	2	1	1	0	0
Weston-super-Mare - -	965	358	521	85	1	2	1	1	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	18,011	6,993	9,914	1,077	27	98	57	41	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 55.										
Andover - - - - -	623	189	383	50	1	4	2	2	0	0
Blandford - - - -	676	198	410	66	2	4	2	2	0	0
Bridport - - - - -	1,175	299	744	131	1	1	1	0	0	0
Christchurch - - -	618	256	318	41	3	0	0	0	0	0
Crewkerne - - - -	435	145	251	39	0	1	0	1	0	0
Dorchester - - - -	474	145	302	27	0	3	1	2	0	0
Fordingbridge - - -	449	185	232	32	0	2	1	1	0	0
Poole - - - - -	510	224	233	53	0	4	3	1	0	0
Salisbury - - - -	1,237	479	743	63	2	4	1	3	0	0
Shaftesbury - - -	809	236	513	59	1	1	1	0	0	0
Wareham - - - - -	263	96	151	15	1	0	0	0	0	0
Weymouth - - - -	874	279	449	146	0	1	1	0	0	0
Wimborne Minster - -	563	186	347	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wincanton - - - -	643	207	386	50	0	1	1	0	0	0
Yeovil - - - - -	1,350	470	773	107	0	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - - -	10,749	3,594	6,235	909	11	27	14	13	0	0

COURT TOWN.	P L A I N T S.					I M P R I S O N M E N T S.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5 s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1 s. and not exceeding 5 s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1 s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5 s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1 s. and did not exceed 5 s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1 s.
CIRCUIT No. 57.										
Axminster - - -	511	188	265	57	1	0	0	0	0	0
Barnstaple - - -	1,440	545	779	113	3	1	0	0	1	0
Bideford - - -	846	251	525	66	4	1	1	0	0	0
Bridgwater - - -	1,396	530	752	113	1	0	0	0	0	0
Chard - - -	503	157	279	66	1	0	0	0	0	0
Honiton - - -	667	215	405	47	0	1	0	1	0	0
Langport - - -	622	183	383	56	0	1	0	1	0	0
South Molton - - -	339	133	189	16	1	0	0	0	0	0
Taunton - - -	1,342	503	732	106	1	1	1	0	0	0
Tiverton - - -	917	285	519	112	1	0	0	0	0	0
Torrington - - -	338	102	218	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wellington (Somerset) -	577	169	353	51	4	0	0	0	0	0
Williton - - -	582	164	349	66	3	1	0	1	0	0
TOTALS - - -	10,080	3,425	5,748	887	20	6	2	3	1	0
CIRCUIT No. 58.										
Crediton - - -	456	130	274	42	10	1	0	1	0	0
East Stonehouse - -	6,062	2,301	3,248	501	12	38	12	26	0	0
Exeter - - -	3,846	1,282	2,209	351	4	5	2	3	0	0
Kingsbridge - - -	320	102	185	31	2	1	0	1	0	0
Newton Abbot and Torquay	2,092	771	1,194	125	2	9	5	4	0	0
Okehampton - - -	392	153	209	25	5	1	1	0	0	0
Tavistock - - -	1,016	313	614	88	1	0	0	0	0	0
Totnes and Churston Ferrers	690	281	363	46	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	14,874	5,333	8,296	1,209	36	55	20	35	0	0
CIRCUIT No. 59.										
Bodmin - - -	483	148	290	42	3	1	0	1	0	0
Camelford - - -	296	85	186	25	0	1	1	0	0	0
Falmouth - - -	600	182	348	66	4	0	0	0	0	0
Helston - - -	377	161	191	21	4	0	0	0	0	0
Holsworthy - - -	387	146	212	28	1	0	0	0	0	0
Launceston - - -	607	172	376	55	4	1	1	0	0	0
Liskeard - - -	1,000	273	616	111	0	0	0	0	0	0
Penzance - - -	1,133	419	624	87	3	0	0	0	0	0
Redruth - - -	2,133	584	1,310	229	10	0	0	0	0	0
St. Austell - - -	1,079	375	615	86	3	0	0	0	0	0
St. Columb - - -	303	140	147	15	1	1	1	0	0	0
Truro - - -	1,776	479	1,148	146	3	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS - - -	10,174	3,164	6,063	911	36	4	3	1	0	0

SUMMARY.

CIRCUITS.	PLAINTS.					IMPRISONMENTS.				
	1. Number entered in 1874.	2. Number entered for Sums exceeding 40 s.	3. Number entered for Sums exceeding 5s. and not exceeding 40 s.	4. Number entered for Sums exceeding 1s. and not exceeding 5s.	5. Number entered for Sums not exceeding 1s.	6. Number of Persons Imprisoned in 1874.	7. Number of such Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 40 s.	8. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 5s. and did not exceed 40 s.	9. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made exceeded 1s. and did not exceed 5s.	10. Number of Persons Imprisoned where the Sum in respect of which Default was made did not exceed 1s.
Circuit No. 1 -	9,218	4,138	4,758	322	0	54	30	24	0	0
" 2 -	17,186	6,250	10,119	811	6	69	42	27	0	0
" 3 -	11,647	4,797	6,087	756	7	227	131	96	0	0
" 4 -	11,202	4,932	5,749	514	7	47	22	25	0	0
" 5 -	16,280	5,274	9,887	1,096	23	69	36	33	0	0
" 6 -	28,156	10,693	16,007	1,438	18	111	53	58	0	0
" 7 -	23,404	7,871	13,358	2,154	21	423	212	209	2	0
" 8 -	24,861	6,953	16,236	1,648	24	76	30	43	3	0
" 9 -	15,875	4,793	9,636	1,394	47	155	61	91	3	0
" 11 -	13,302	5,964	6,767	563	8	27	17	10	0	0
" 12 -	25,016	6,836	16,648	1,525	7	150	73	77	0	0
" 13 -	25,936	7,729	16,482	1,706	19	39	27	12	0	0
" 14 -	29,825	10,595	17,444	1,765	21	179	113	66	0	0
" 15 -	15,332	6,010	8,386	920	16	65	43	22	0	0
" 16 -	12,289	4,662	6,781	831	15	23	10	12	1	0
" 17 -	11,876	4,046	6,950	838	42	46	31	14	1	0
" 18 -	18,386	6,176	11,145	1,049	16	122	57	65	0	0
" 19 -	21,536	6,260	13,568	1,673	35	218	84	134	0	0
" 20 -	23,162	6,873	14,447	1,820	22	221	73	148	0	0
" 21 -	35,140	13,655	19,776	1,702	7	165	64	98	3	0
" 22 -	14,313	3,717	8,943	1,645	8	77	24	53	0	0
" 23 -	19,694	5,515	12,488	1,657	34	78	15	63	0	0
" 24 -	15,865	5,754	8,645	1,460	6	17	9	8	0	0
" 25 -	22,070	7,261	13,481	1,302	26	83	30	53	0	0
" 26 -	20,592	6,506	12,712	1,364	10	39	26	13	0	0
" 27 -	11,518	4,192	6,419	883	24	61	41	20	0	0
" 28 -	6,408	2,647	3,411	344	6	11	7	4	0	0
" 29 -	12,790	5,119	6,730	920	21	54	30	24	0	0
" 30 -	16,813	6,603	9,304	891	15	107	44	63	0	0
" 31 -	9,169	3,438	4,904	819	8	11	6	5	0	0
" 32 -	7,866	2,838	4,472	538	18	11	8	3	0	0
" 33 -	11,003	4,046	6,032	914	16	33	16	17	0	0
" 35 -	13,878	4,251	8,336	1,258	33	27	14	13	0	0
" 36 -	10,337	3,756	5,183	1,389	9	27	12	15	0	0
" 37 -	12,612	4,657	6,844	1,093	18	71	35	36	0	0
" 38 -	11,906	3,761	7,060	1,079	6	71	28	42	1	0
" 39 -	9,361	3,220	5,584	544	13	29	5	24	0	0
" 40 -	17,984	5,993	10,846	1,113	32	55	24	31	0	0
" 41 -	13,653	5,768	7,151	724	10	60	26	32	2	0
" 42 -	10,734	5,522	4,788	415	9	31	24	7	0	0
" 43 -	16,430	7,819	7,775	819	17	150	116	33	1	0
" 44 -	12,315	7,391	4,516	394	14	55	43	11	1	0
" 45 -	14,990	6,351	7,647	904	88	75	48	27	0	0
" 46 -	12,712	5,676	6,366	651	19	39	17	22	0	0
" 47 -	13,814	5,045	7,956	803	10	125	72	49	4	0
" 48 -	14,001	4,237	8,447	1,299	18	126	25	101	0	0
" 49 -	7,242	2,646	4,011	570	15	38	16	22	0	0
" 50 -	13,392	5,517	6,894	944	37	55	31	24	0	0
" 51 -	12,884	5,231	7,047	591	15	77	40	37	0	0
" 52 -	11,528	3,880	6,657	960	31	28	12	16	0	0
" 53 -	13,394	4,330	7,957	1,070	37	41	9	32	0	0
" 54 -	18,011	6,993	9,914	1,077	27	98	57	41	0	0
" 55 -	10,749	3,594	6,235	909	11	27	14	13	0	0
" 57 -	10,080	3,425	5,748	887	20	6	2	3	1	0
" 58 -	14,874	5,333	8,296	1,209	36	55	20	35	0	0
" 59 -	10,174	3,164	6,063	911	36	4	3	1	0	0
TOTALS -	864,790	309,708	495,093	58,875	1,114	4,438	2,158	2,257	23	0

NOTE.—The number of days each person imprisoned lay in prison has, with the assent of the Honourable Member who moved the Return, not been added, as similar information for the year 1873 is given in Parliamentary Paper, No. 347, of the Session 1874.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS, &c.).

RETURN from every COUNTY COURT in
England and Wales of certain Particulars
relative to PLAINTS and IMPRISONMENTS.

(*Mr. Bass.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
2 August 1875.*

317

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 9 March 1875;—for,

COPY

OF

ANNUAL REPORT,

For 1874,

OF

CAPTAIN HARRIS,

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS,

ON THE OPERATION OF THE

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
12 March 1875.

R E P O R T.

Metropolitan Police Office, 4, Whitehall-place,
19 February 1875.

Sir,

1. IN submitting, for the information of Mr. Secretary Cross, my Annual Report for 1874, on the operation of the Contagious Diseases Acts, I have to state that the common women, in the several places subject to the Acts, have attended medical examination with even greater regularity than during the year 1873; the average number of examinations made being 22·73, whereas in 1873 it was only 21·46. If no cause had existed to prevent their examination, they would not have been present upon more than 26 occasions during the year.

2. The police employed specially under the Acts have discharged their duties to my entire satisfaction, and I can again report that not a single case of excess, or violation of duty, has been brought to my notice. I learn, too, with pleasure, that the police have been frequently assisted by some of the most influential inhabitants of the towns in which the Acts are in operation, in enforcing the provisions of the law. The Acts have been fully enforced, and all women following the calling of prostitutes have been placed on the register, if they persisted in pursuing that course of life after being cautioned by the police.

3. One thousand six hundred and fifty women have been registered for the first time during the year, chiefly coming from the unprotected districts; yet, notwithstanding this influx of "new comers," the number of common women remaining on the register at the end of the year was 49 less than in the preceding year; this forms a total decrease of 2,780 since the Acts came into operation. In 5,928 cases women signed the voluntary submission form; in 31 cases applications for summonses were made for non-submission, but in only 14 cases was it necessary to obtain a magistrate's order to bring these women within the provisions of the Acts. In 142 cases proceedings were taken for neglecting to attend medical examination after signing the voluntary submission form, or receiving a magistrate's order to attend.

4. In towns where the Acts are in force, the voice of the general public is strongly in their favour; the opposition proceeds from persons ignorant of the law, or who reside in places distant from the scene of their operation.

5. Respectable persons residing within a protected district have been known to say that they would gladly pay a special rate for the maintenance of the Acts, so much do they contribute towards the peace and quietness of a town.

6. Wherever a chance exists of reclaiming a woman, every effort is made before she is brought under the operation of the Acts; and after she has signed the voluntary submission form the opportunity is still given her of returning to her friends.

One hundred and nineteen young girls (*see* Return No. 5) between the ages of 12 and 18, and 123 women between the ages of 18 and 30, and 12 above that age, who had been found in bad company and improper places, have been rescued. The following cases may be mentioned in illustration of the working of the Acts:—

On the 2nd January 1874, Eliza, aged 19, of 11, Street, Chatham, had left her home, and was subsequently found in the company of prostitutes and soldiers, by police constable (106) William Verrier. The constable pointed out the consequences of her remaining in such company, where-
upon

upon she consented to return to her home, and her mother expressed her thanks for having saved her child from ruin.

On the 22nd January, Eliza, aged 18, was found in a brothel at Castle-lane, Southampton, by police constable Green; she had been persuaded to leave her situation at, where her relations also resided, by a prostitute named Cash. The inspector saw, warned her as to the consequences of being in such a place, and induced her to leave for her home at once.

On the 13th February, Caroline, aged 18, was found in a brothel at St. George's Passage, by police constables Fuller and Green, in company of two soldiers and a prostitute. She was told that her relations (who reside in Southampton) would be informed of her conduct, at which she was very much frightened, and promised she would never enter such a place again. She is now doing well.

On the 5th February, Kate, aged 16, residing with her parents, shopkeepers, at No. 23, was found by police constable Scott, in a brothel, at Portsmouth, in company of several prostitutes. She informed the constable that she had just left her situation, and had as yet done nothing wrong. The constable at once communicated with her mother, who came to the brothel, and took her home; she was very thankful to the police for the steps taken in the matter. She has not been seen in bad company since.

On the 2nd March, Julia, aged 18, of No. 9,, was found at 10 P.M. at Maidstone, in the company of soldiers and prostitutes. Her parents were made acquainted with the circumstance the following morning, and were very thankful for the information. The girl has not been seen in bad company since.

On the 23rd March, Emma, aged 15, was seen about the streets of Windsor, with her two sisters, both registered prostitutes. She was cautioned by police constable Fuller, when she expressed a wish to enter a home. The district Scripture reader was communicated with, and the girl was taken to a home in London.

On the 14th January, Jane, aged 16, came from to Plymouth, where she met a woman of bad character, who took her to a brothel in Fore-street, Stonehouse, where she was found, almost immediately, by police constable (35) Frost. The girl, who was much alarmed at being found in such a place by the police, at once left the house as advised, and returned to her friends.

On the 20th April, Elizabeth, aged 19, married, was found by the police in a brothel, at Plymouth, where she had been taken by another married woman of bad character; in consequence, came to the inspector's office the following day, in great distress of mind, and promised never to go to such a house again, or associate with the woman who took her there. There is no doubt but that she has kept her word.

On the 4th May, Alice, and Alice, both aged 15, were found by the police, at 9.30 P.M., in the company of two young soldiers in the barrack field, Colchester. The police took them home and gave information to their parents; they have not been seen since in the company of soldiers.

On the 9th May, Mary Anne, aged 19, in respectable service near Maidstone, was, by a serjeant in the regiment (to whom she was engaged to be married), induced to visit Dover for the day. He detained her beyond the hour at which the train returned, and on pretence of taking her to a respectable lodging, brought her to a notorious brothel. The police saw them enter at 9.5 P.M., and directly after, the soldier rushed off to barracks for leave to sleep out. The police at once entered the house and made the keeper produce the girl. She was horrified to learn her position, at once left the house, was taken to a respectable inn for the night, and returned home next day, most grateful for her rescue.

On the 26th May, Harriet, aged 15, an orphan, was found at a beer-house

house where common women resort. Having no relations in the neighbourhood, she was sent by Inspector Anniss into a home in Ham-street, Plymouth, and is doing well.

On the 9th June, Alice, aged 17, was found in the barrack field, Woolwich, at 3 P.M., by police constable (146) Cogger. In answer to questions she stated that she had left her situation, and sold the greater part of her clothing, and had no place to go to. The constable persuaded her to accompany him to Wood-street Home, which she did, and was received by the matron. The police afterwards ascertained that she was likely to do well.

On the 20th June, Ruth, aged 19, was found by police constable (146) Cogger, at 8 P.M. in a low brothel, in Rope-yard Rails, Woolwich, and, in answer to questions, told him that she had been there three days, but was not aware of the sort of place it was; that she was respectable, and wished to keep herself so. The constable pointed out the impossibility of her doing that if she remained where she was, and persuaded her to accompany him to the Wood-street Home, where she was received by the matron. It was afterwards ascertained that she remained in the "home" about a week, and was then sent to her friends at, Herts.

On the 23rd June, Jane, aged 16, a servant girl, was found in a brothel, in Raleigh-street, Plymouth, where she had been taken by a man; and they were in the act of being shown to a bedroom by the keeper, when police serjeant (3) Ford entered the house. She at once left the house, and returned home, very much frightened at being found where she was. It is not known that she has conducted herself improperly since.

On the 19th June, Rosa, aged 17, a simple country girl, was seen loitering about the streets of Aldershot at 11.30 P.M. On being spoken to by the police, she stated that she had obtained a situation at Mr. Archer's Coffee House, to which place she was going in the morning. Upon being informed that "Archer's" was a low brothel, and on her going there it was likely she would be ruined, she expressed herself thankful, and said she would return to her friends. She has not been seen since.

On the 12th March, Sarah, aged 21, a servant who had just left her situation at Mr., High-street, Portsmouth, was found by police constable Scott in a low brothel with prostitutes. She said she had lost her place through staying out late with a soldier, and feared she should not obtain another situation. The constable advised her to go to the lock hospital, and she remained there until her aunt was communicated with, who afterwards came to the hospital and took her home. She has conducted herself well since.

On the 5th July, a married lady was found by police constable Disberry in a brothel in Pond-lane, Devonport, with a gentleman, at 10.30 P.M. She left at once on being spoken to. She came to the inspector next day in great distress of mind, and stated that she had walked out with the gentleman she was found with, and that he had given her wine, and afterwards had taken her to the brothel. She blamed herself for going to a house at that hour of the night without inquiring its character, and was thankful that the police constable had come in just as she had entered the house, or she might have had further cause to blame herself.

On the 25th July, Elizabeth, aged 26, married, was found by the police in a brothel at Sheerness. She said she was not a prostitute, neither did she know she was in a brothel; she had always thought the woman who occupied the room to be respectable, and consequently accepted the invitation to the house. She was advised by police to leave at once, which she did, and was conducted to respectable lodgings. Subsequently she expressed her gratitude for the assistance rendered her.

On the 17th September, Elinor, aged 18, of Chatham, was found at midnight in a field on the Maidstone-road, with an officer of the Navy; had it not been for the arrival of the constables, there can be no doubt but that this young woman would have been ruined. The constables spoke to her, and
advised

advised her to return home ; this she did. On the following morning, Inspector Capon called on her parents, and informed them (in her presence) of what had occurred. The girl did not deny it, and said, if it had not been for the timely arrival of the constables, this officer would have seduced her. The parents expressed their grateful thanks to the police for having saved their child.

On the 15th August, Mary, aged 13, left her home, street, Plymouth, and after visiting several resorts of common prostitutes, stopped away all night. Inspector Annis informed her mother where she had been, and censured severely an elder girl who had induced her to stop away. Mary has conducted herself very well ever since.

On the 9th June, Annie, aged 22, was found to be associating with a prostitute, and seen about the streets of Southampton with men. The mother was seen and acquainted, when she informed the inspector of police that she had been deceived with regard to the character of the woman her daughter had been constantly seen with, and she was very thankful for the information given. The girl has not been seen since.

On the 19th October, Emma, aged 17, residing with her mother at street, Portsmouth, was found in a brothel by police constable Cousins with a man, who she said had induced her to enter the house, which she had no idea was a brothel. She was very grateful to the constable for his advice and information, and left the house at once. She is stated to be doing well.

On the 30th October, three country girls from Petersfield, two aged 17 and one 23, were found in a brothel at Aldershot, where they had slept the previous night, having been taken there by a prostitute. They seemed quite ignorant of the character of the house, and seemed grateful when brought out of it. They immediately left the town, and were seen on the road making their way back to Petersfield.

On the 25th November, Annie, aged 19, an orphan, was found in a brothel, where she had been taken by a prostitute to lodge ; on being informed of the character of the house, she left at once, and, having no friends, was sent to the Abbey Home, Plymouth, the same night.

On the 3rd November, Harriet, aged 14, of, Gravesend, was found in the company of prostitutes ; her mother was seen and made acquainted the following day, and she has not been seen in bad company since.

7. In addition to the above, 50 young creatures (*see* Return, No. 6) between the ages of 15 and 18, and 128 women between 18 and 30, and 28 above that age, who had commenced an immoral life, abandoned it on being cautioned by the police ; their names were, therefore, not placed upon the register.

On the 23rd January, Selina, aged 17, an orphan, came to Plymouth from and went to reside at a brothel in Rendle-street, where she was found the next morning by the police ; she expressed great regret at what she had done, and was at once sent to the Abbey Home.

On the 14th March, Julia, aged 18, and Charlotte, aged 15, sisters, residing with their parents at street, Gosport, were found by police constable Cheyney, in the company of prostitutes and soldiers, and conducting themselves in such a manner as left no doubt they had commenced a life of prostitution. The constable called them aside, and pointed out the result of such a course of life, and advised them to return home, which they did. The constable afterwards informed their parents, who expressed their thanks to him for bringing the matter under their notice, of which they were quite ignorant. Neither of the girls have been seen in bad company since.

On the 24th April, Susan, aged 17, left her situation in street, Colchester, and commenced an immoral life. Her father, who resided at, in Suffolk, hearing that she had left her situation, came to Colchester for the purpose of finding her, and taking her home. He spent two days and a night looking for her, but was unsuccessful. On the day after he had left, she was found by the police employed under the Contagious Diseases

Acts, at a low lodging house. She told the constable that she was afraid to go home, as her father, no doubt, knew of her disgrace. The constable took her to Mrs. Round, a benevolent lady in the town, who placed her in her (Mrs. Round's) Home, until a situation could be procured for her. The father was informed of her rescue.

On the 12th October, Lillian, aged 21, a governess out of a situation, residing at street, Southsea, was seen by the police to leave a brothel with a gentleman. The constable spoke to her, when she admitted having been there for an immoral purpose, and that she had only been there once before; and that she was driven to the act by necessity, being out of a situation. She appeared to feel her position acutely, and said it would prove a caution to her for life. She has not been known to misconduct herself since.

On the 12th August, Annie, an orphan, residing with her aunt, a very respectable woman, was found in a brothel with a man at Plymouth. The aunt was informed by Inspector Anniss of the circumstance, and from that time the girl has conducted herself well.

On the 19th October, Mary, aged 17, was found in a bed-room at a brothel in Raleigh-street, Plymouth, with a Mr. G This person came to the inspector's office in a blustering manner, to press that the girl might not be brought under the operation of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and that her friends might not be informed where she had been found. He stated that he belonged to the "Rescue Society," London, and was in the brothel for the purpose of inducing her to enter a London Home. On being informed by the inspector that his statement could not be accepted, and that the girl would be dealt with without reference to him, he admitted that his statement was false. The mother, a widow, was informed where her daughter had been found; and the girl stated that she had been sent for by the brothel keeper to do some needlework for her, and that the gentleman was introduced to her in the room (a bed room) where she was found by the police; that he had had connection with her, and that he was the second person only who had done so. The girl promised never to go to the house again, and she has conducted herself well since.

8. The number of brothels (*see* Return, No. 3) has been reduced this year by 85, showing a total decrease of 678 brothels that have been suppressed within the protected districts since the Acts came into operation. Of these, 108 were public houses, and 251 beer-houses. I regret, however, to say, that there are 44 public houses and 12 beer-houses still used as brothels, notwithstanding the penalties imposed by the Act 35 & 36 Vict. c. 94, s. 15 (Intoxicating Liquor Licensing Act, 1872); of this number, 21 public houses and 7 beer-houses are situated at Chatham.

Two brothel keepers have been convicted during the year for allowing diseased prostitutes to resort to their houses; one was sent to gaol for two months with hard labour, the other was fined 5 *l.* and costs.

Three other brothel keepers who were found to be harbouring juvenile prostitutes, and permitting young girls to frequent their houses, closed their brothels and left the district on being cautioned by the police; whilst 30 pensioners from the Army and Navy, who were obtaining their living by keeping disreputable houses, were told that if they did not give up their occupation, a report would be made to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, or the Secretary of State for War, of their conduct, with a view to their pensions being stopped; 28 at once gave up the keeping of brothels, and two who refused, were, upon representation being made, deprived of their pensions.

9. Two thousand and forty-one common women have been registered during the year, including those re-registered (*see* Return, No. 4), chiefly from the unprotected districts. Of this number, 646, or 32·76 per cent. of those examined (1,972) were found to be diseased on their first examination; whilst 130 only, or 6·54 per cent. of those examined (1,989) out of 2,121 women remaining on the register on the 31st December 1873, were found to be diseased. With respect to the general condition

condition of the common women, I am informed that there has been, during the past year, a great diminution in the number of apprehensions for drunkenness, and disorderly conduct, whilst their outward demeanour seems to be improved.

10. The per-centages of disease amongst them has considerably diminished, and would have been still further reduced had it not been, as I before stated, that women come from unprotected districts, and insist upon signing the voluntary submission form, in order that their names may be placed on the register, and that by this means they may gain admission into hospital.

11. It is much to be regretted that there is no provision in the Acts making persons wilfully communicating disease liable to punishment.

(signed) *William C. Harris,*
Assistant Commissioner of Police of
the Metropolis.

Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Bart., M.P.,
Under Secretary of State,
Home Office.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN showing the Number of known COMMON WOMEN; the Number taken on the Register, and Removed found free from Disease, as also the Number found Diseased,

YEAR.	REGISTRATIONS.									REMOVALS.						Total Number of Individual Women remaining on the Register.	Total Number of known Common Women at the time the Acts were first put in operation, as also the Number of known Common Women on the 31st December of each succeeding Year.	A
	Number of Individual Women Registered for the First time during the Year.	Number of Cases in which Women, removed from the Register during the Year, were Re-registered.					Total Number of Individual Women Registered for the First Time during the Year, including each case in which Women have been Re-registered.	Number of Individual Women remaining on the Register on the last Saturday of preceding Year.	TOTAL.	Number of Cases in which Women were removed from the Register.								
		First Time.	Second Time.	Third Time.	Fourth Time.	Fifth Time.				Left the District.	Married.	Entered Homes.	Returned to Friends.	Died.				
(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)	(14.)	(15.)	(16.)			
1864	30	-	-	-	-	30	2	30	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	1		
1865	823	-	-	-	-	823	30	853	67	11	15	74	4	682	3,418	2		
1866	791	6	1	-	-	798	682	1,480	181	15	40	101	15	1,128	2,613	3		
1867	1,117	20	8	-	-	1,145	1,128	2,273	358	46	59	140	15	1,655	2,579	4		
1868	2,157	42	13	2	1	2,215	1,655	3,870	738	105	133	444	23	2,427	2,523	5		
1869	1,608	120	19	2	-	1,749	2,427	4,176	998	156	143	377	41	2,461	2,489	6		
1870	2,546	338	36	7	1	2,928	2,461	5,389	1,558	157	244	730	50	2,650	2,650	7		
1871	1,856	416	31	4	-	2,307	2,650	4,957	1,424	88	273	708	53	2,411	2,411	8		
1872	1,625	401	25	1	1	2,054	2,411	4,465	1,169	97	252	606	51	2,290	2,290	9		
1873	1,568	321	15	-	-	1,904	2,290	4,194	1,014	72	200	750	37	2,121	2,121	10		
1874	1,650	363	28	-	-	2,041	2,121	4,162	1,122	67	212	639	50	2,072	2,072	11		

(a) Twenty women of the Chatham District, who were admitted into hospital before the arrangements were made for the enforcement of the Acts, are not included in this number, but are nevertheless included in the number shown as discharged from hospital, and marked (b).

(c) Five women of the Woolwich District, who were admitted into hospital before the arrangements were fully made for the enforcement of the Acts, are not included in this number, but are nevertheless included in the number shown as discharged from hospital, and marked (d).

(Note 1).—All common women who were found diseased (see Column 21) were admitted into the lock hospitals on the certificates of the visiting surgeons, but only a portion of the known common women in the various districts where the Acts were in operation were in the first instance brought up for medical examination, the insufficiency of the hospital accommodation rendering it inexpedient to at once bring up the whole of those whom there was good cause to believe had contracted venereal disease. The Act of 1866, providing for the regular or periodical examination of common women in the different districts, came into operation on the 1st of October of that year; but owing to the small number of beds available at the time at the different lock hospitals, and the large number of known common women who had not been brought under the operation of the Acts (compare the numbers in Columns 15 and 16), the women were exempted from a periodical medical examination, and the system of bringing up for examination only such known common women as there was good cause to believe to be affected with venereal disease continued to remain in force until the year 1868, at which time the hospital accommodation, being greatly increased, the whole of the known common women in the several districts were ordered to be placed on the register. The registration was however gradual, and the periodical medical examinations, which had been instituted in such districts where it was considered practicable, were necessarily irregular, in consequence of the large number of women found to be diseased (see figures in Column 21, for the years 1868 and 1869). It was therefore not until the commencement of the year 1870 that a complete registration was made, since which time the women have, in nearly all cases, undergone a fortnightly periodical medical examination. The number of beds available for occupation in the several hospitals on the 31st of December of each year was as follows:—

	1864.	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
Number of beds available	40	118	202	292	497	592	666	666*	646	646	646

(Note 2).—The numbers for the years 1865, shown in each return which has been compiled for the several districts, includes those figures shown in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, and Chatham Returns respectively. Woolwich is included in 1866, Aldershot in 1867, Windsor and Shorncliffe in 1868, Colchester in 1869, Greenwich, Winchester, Dover, Canterbury, Deal, Maidstone, Gravesend, and Southampton in 1870. The dates on which the Acts were first put in operation are as follows:—

Portsmouth,	3 Dec. 1864	Woolwich,	14 Nov. 1866	Colchester,	27 Jan. 1869	Dover,	19 Jan. 1870	Maidstone,	15 Feb. 1870
Devonport,	1 April 1865	Aldershot,	12 April 1867	Greenwich,	6 Jan. 1870	Canterbury,	21 Jan. 1870	Gravesend,	17 Feb. 1870
Sheerness,	9 June 1865	Windsor,	1 April 1868	Winchester,	6 Jan. 1870	Deal,	5 Feb. 1870	Southampton,	27 May 1870
Chatham,	12 June 1865	Shorncliffe,	27 July 1868						

(Note 3).—Registration of Common Women.—Column 1 shows the number of individual women registered for the first time during the year. Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, show the number of cases in which women were re-registered during the year, and includes such women as were on the register at the end of the year, together with those registered for the first time during the year, who, on being removed from the register during the year, again resumed

— No. 1. —

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

therefrom, likewise the Number remaining on the Register; the Number of COMMON WOMEN Examined and in the several Districts, for each of the undermentioned Years.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.						HOSPITAL.				SUMMONSES.				PER-CENTAGES.			
Number of Individual Women which attended for Medical Examination.	Number of Cases in which Women signed the Voluntary Submission Form to attend for Medical Examination for a prescribed Period.	Number of Cases in which Women received a Magistrate's Order to attend for Medical Examination for a prescribed Period.	Number of Cases in which Women were Examined by the Visiting Surgeon and found to be	Free from Disease.	Diseased, and admitted into Hospital.	TOTAL.	Number of Cases in which Women were discharged from Hospital Cured, and still continued to follow former Pursuits.	Number of Cases in which Women were discharged from Hospital, and returned to Friends, &c.	Number of Cases in which Women were discharged from Hospital Incurable.	Total Number of Individual Women remaining in Hospital.	Number of Cases in which Women were proceeded against by Information before the Magistrates for Non-submission to Acts.	Number of Cases in which Women were proceeded against by Summons for not attending Medical Examination, after signing Voluntary Submission Form, or receiving Magistrate's Order to attend	Number of Cases in which Women were proceeded against by Summons for conducting themselves as Prostitutes after being discharged from Hospital Uncured.	Average Number of Women on the Register.	Annual Ratio per Cent. of Cases of Disease, calculated on the Average Number of Women on the Register.	Annual Ratio of Cases of Disease per 100 of Cases in which Women were on the Register.	Ratio of Cases of Disease per 100 of Examinations made by the Visiting Surgeons.
(17.)	(18.)	(19.)	(20.)	(21.)	(22.)	(23.)	(24.)	(25.)	(26.)	(27.)	(28.)	(29.)	(30.)	(31.)	(32.)	(33.)	
1	30	-	-	12	18	30	6	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	
2	840	-	-	244	(a) 783	1,027	(b) 570	127	-	118	-	-	-	406	237.27	91.79	76.24
3	1,311	-	-	558	(c) 1,103	1,661	(d) 865	163	19	179	-	-	-	971	121.60	74.52	66.40
4	1,923	-	-	1,362	1,977	3,339	1,622	222	36	276	-	-	-	1,430	140.71	86.97	59.20
5	3,445	-	9	6,605	4,363	10,968	3,754	359	58	468	16	4	-	2,210	202.74	112.73	39.77
6	3,954	6,401	8	29,515	4,767	34,282	4,355	430	63	387	51	8	-	2,455	194.73	114.15	13.90
7	4,889	7,122	49	48,078	4,292	52,370	3,819	464	24	372	85	127	-	2,977	148.25	79.64	8.19
8	4,201	6,442	36	42,564	3,477	46,041	3,081	492	12	264	106	144	-	2,567	135.44	70.14	7.55
9	3,869	6,356	20	37,989	3,484	41,473	3,020	395	3	330	33	70	1	2,371	146.94	78.03	8.40
10	3,669	5,871	33	38,996	3,215	42,211	2,864	442	5	234	62	174	2	2,268	141.75	76.66	7.62
11	3,623	5,928	14	39,804	2,981	42,785	2,532	417	4	262	31	142	-	2,174	137.31	71.62	6.97

resumed prostitution in the district. Column 7 is the total of the foregoing columns; 8 signifies the number of women who were on the register at the end of the preceding year, and who were consequently brought forward on the register on the 1st day of the succeeding year; 9 is the total of Columns 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8, and shows the number of registrations made during the year.

(Note 4).—Removals from the Register.—Columns 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, show the number of cases in which women were removed from the register, and the cause of such removals; in these totals are included those figures shown in Column 24.

(Note 5).—Women remaining on the register.—The numbers in Column 15 are arrived at by deducting the total of those shown in 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, from the numbers shown in Column 9.

(Note 6).—Known Common Women.—The first number (3,418) shown in Column 16 is the number of common women known to have been in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, and Chatham districts when the Acts were first put in operation; the succeeding numbers show the number of known common women in the various districts on the 31st December of each year. (For further information, see note to Return 2.)

(Note 7).—Medical Examinations.—Column 17 is merely the number of individual women which attended medical examination; 18 shows the number of cases in which women voluntarily signed the submission form during the year on discharge from hospital, leaving Homes, &c., and practising prostitution, as also new comers; 19 is the number of cases in which women, who were leading the life of prostitutes refused to sign the submission form, and received magistrates' orders to attend for medical examination; 20 is the number of cases in which women were found free from disease; 21 is the number found diseased and admitted into hospital on certificates of visiting surgeons; and 22 is the total number of cases in which women were medically examined.

(Note 8).—Admissions to Hospital, &c.—Column 23 contains the number of cases in which women returned to their former pursuits on being discharged from hospital cured; 24 those who returned to their friends, entered Homes, &c., on discharge from hospital. Column 25 shows the number of women discharged from hospital incurable within the period prescribed by the Acts. The figures in Column 26 are the number of women remaining in hospital at the end of each year, and may be arrived at as follows: Add together the figures in Columns 23, 24, and 25 for the year 1864, and deduct the total from the 18 shown in Column 21 as admitted into hospital for that year, thus leaving 12; add the 12 which is in Column 26 to the 783 fresh admissions shown in Column 21 for 1865, which increases it to 795; then add together the figures in Columns 23, 24, and 25, which forms a total of 697 to be deducted from the 795; thus leaving 98 women as remaining in hospital at the end of the year 1865; but as 20 women are included in Column 23, and not in Column 21 (see notes (a) and (b)), this number must be added to the 98, thereby increasing it to 118.

(Note 9).—Summonses.—Column 27 shows the number of cases in which common women persistently continued to practice prostitution, and would not sign the submission form; these women had the option of signing the submission form, or being proceeded against by information before the magistrates, or of ceasing prostitution, when they would no longer be amenable to the provisions of the Acts. Those which did not appear before the magistrates, subsequently signed the submission form, or returned to their friends, or entered Homes, &c.; the latter were consequently removed from the register. For the number in which magistrates' orders were made, see Column 19. Column 28 shows the number of cases in which women were proceeded against by summons before the magistrates for not attending medical examination.

(Note 10).—Average Number of Women on the Register.—Column 30 is the weekly average number of women on the register during the time the Acts have been in operation, and forms the basis upon which the calculation is made to find the amount of venereal disease existing amongst every 100 of women who were continuously on the register during the year; the necessary correction being made in calculating the rates for broken periods to reduce it to an annual average.

(Note 11).—Per-centages of Disease.—Column 31 is the amount of disease existing amongst every 100 of women who were continuously on the register throughout the year, and is calculated upon the annual average of women upon the register; 32 gives the amount of disease existing amongst every 100 of registrations made in the course of the year, and is calculated upon the total number of registrations made throughout the year (vide figures in Column 9); 33 gives the amount of disease existing amongst every 100 cases in which women were medically examined during the year, and is calculated upon the total number of examinations made by the visiting surgeons throughout the year (see figures in Column 22).

No. 1—continued.

RETURN showing the Number of known COMMON WOMEN; the Number taken on the Register, and Removed found free from Disease, as also the Number found Diseased in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, Deal, Maidstone, Gravesend, and Southampton Districts, for each of the undermentioned Years.

DISTRICTS.	Year.	REGISTRATIONS.							REMOVALS.					Total Number of Individual Women remaining on the Register.	Total Number of Known Common Women at the Time the Acts were first put in Operation, as also the Number of Known Common Women on the 31st December of each succeeding Year.		
		Number of Individual Women Registered for the First Time during the Year.	Number of Cases in which Women, removed from the Register during the Year, were Registered.					Total Number of Individual Women Registered for the First Time during the Year, including each Case in which Women have been Re-registered.	Number of Individual Women remaining on the Register on the last Saturday of preceding Y. ar.	TOTAL.	Number of Cases in which Women were removed from the Register.						
			First Time.	Second Time.	Third Time.	Fourth Time.	Fifth Time.				Left the District.	Married.	Entered Homes.			Returned to Friends.	Died.
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)	(14.)	(15.)	(16.)
PORTSMOUTH - -	1864	30	-	-	-	-	-	30	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	30	-
	1865	331	-	-	-	-	-	331	30	361	-	-	-	-	-	361	1,355
	1866	179	-	-	-	-	-	179	361	540	62	7	4	7	7	453	789
	1867	236	-	-	-	-	-	236	453	689	150	19	4	3	7	506	748
	1868	395	-	-	-	-	-	395	506	901	170	25	5	46	10	645	739
	1869	426	67	1	-	-	-	494	645	1,139	303	43	10	55	6	722	730
	1870	293	71	5	-	-	-	369	722	1,091	261	45	33	147	15	590	590
	1871	326	90	3	-	-	-	419	590	1,009	232	31	31	116	13	586	586
	1872	318	76	2	-	-	-	396	586	982	249	29	28	81	15	580	580
	1873	326	71	5	-	-	-	402	580	982	220	6	35	158	5	558	558
1874	370	89	5	-	-	-	464	558	1,022	269	14	38	140	6	555	555	
DEVONPORT - -	1865	203	-	-	-	-	-	203	-	203	38	11	15	73	4	62	1,770
	1866	331	2	-	-	-	-	333	62	395	43	5	36	89	6	216	1,238
	1867	296	2	1	-	-	-	299	216	515	21	3	21	78	2	390	1,010
	1868	1,105	6	2	-	-	-	1,113	390	1,503	294	39	67	271	3	829	829
	1869	352	8	-	-	-	-	360	829	1,189	246	78	48	138	18	661	662
	1870	307	6	-	-	-	-	313	661	974	90	52	51	219	5	557	557
	1871	278	24	3	-	-	-	305	557	862	76	18	64	194	7	503	503
	1872	268	32	4	-	-	-	304	503	807	44	25	88	170	6	474	474
	1873	244	30	-	-	-	-	274	474	748	41	31	65	160	4	447	447
	1874	223	33	-	-	-	-	256	447	703	36	19	49	135	12	452	452
SHEERNESS - -	1865	73	-	-	-	-	-	73	-	73	17	-	-	1	-	55	73
	1866	63	2	-	-	-	-	65	55	120	43	3	-	5	-	67	67
	1867	45	-	-	-	-	-	45	67	112	44	3	2	6	3	54	60
	1868	30	-	-	-	-	-	30	54	84	21	4	-	7	2	50	52
	1869	39	-	-	-	-	-	39	50	89	25	3	2	4	1	54	66
	1870	31	8	1	-	-	-	40	54	94	20	2	-	12	1	59	59
	1871	20	12	1	1	-	-	34	59	93	17	-	1	20	1	54	54
	1872	23	6	-	-	-	-	29	54	83	22	3	3	12	1	42	42
	1873	27	9	-	-	-	-	36	42	78	24	1	-	15	-	38	38
	1874	32	14	5	-	-	-	51	38	89	32	-	1	13	1	42	42
CHATHAM - -	1865	216	-	-	-	-	-	216	-	216	12	-	-	-	-	204	220
	1866	105	2	1	-	-	-	108	204	312	33	-	-	-	-	279	279
	1867	34	13	7	-	-	-	54	279	333	40	-	11	17	-	265	265
	1868	49	18	7	1	1	-	76	265	341	32	-	24	46	1	238	238
	1869	137	25	12	2	-	-	176	238	414	52	-	30	42	3	287	287
	1870	261	34	10	6	1	-	312	287	599	272	4	14	24	4	281	281
	1871	189	50	7	3	-	-	249	281	530	242	3	30	46	6	203	203
	1872	173	85	8	1	1	1	269	203	472	224	2	8	44	2	192	192
	1873	150	48	2	-	-	-	200	192	392	126	8	14	67	5	172	172
	1874	212	38	5	-	-	-	255	172	427	149	9	18	53	8	190	190
WOOLWICH - -	1866	113	-	-	-	-	-	113	-	113	-	-	-	-	-	113	240
	1867	233	-	-	-	-	-	233	113	346	75	15	18	23	2	213	230
	1868	172	-	-	-	-	-	172	213	385	85	9	21	33	4	233	233
	1869	162	-	-	-	-	-	162	233	395	110	16	21	36	4	208	215
	1870	134	62	5	-	-	-	201	208	409	116	10	25	54	7	197	197
	1871	199	42	2	-	-	-	243	197	440	146	5	29	56	4	200	200
	1872	131	26	-	-	-	-	157	200	357	93	9	26	56	1	172	172
	1873	110	19	1	-	-	-	130	172	302	84	3	17	47	4	147	147
	1874	145	26	2	-	-	-	173	147	320	96	2	24	46	3	149	149
ALDERSHOT - -	1867	273	5	-	-	-	-	278	-	278	28	6	3	13	1	227	266
	1868	200	15	3	1	-	-	219	227	446	90	20	13	29	2	292	292
	1869	212	15	4	-	-	-	231	292	523	153	8	2	41	4	315	315
	1870	267	24	2	-	-	-	293	315	608	248	12	42	61	6	239	239
	1871	272	45	4	-	-	-	321	239	560	194	10	42	83	4	227	227
	1872	210	50	2	-	-	-	262	227	489	143	3	45	55	8	235	235
	1873	181	40	4	-	-	-	225	235	460	145	2	33	65	9	206	206
	1874	204	36	2	-	-	-	242	206	448	169	-	29	58	5	187	187

No. 1—continued.

therefrom, likewise the Number remaining on the Register, the Number of COMMON WOMEN Examined and Chatham, Woolwich, Aldershot, Windsor, Shorncliffe, Colchester, Greenwich, Winchester, Dover, Canterbury,

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.						HOSPITAL.				SUMMONSES.				PER-CENTAGES.				REMARKS.
Number of Individual Women which attended for Medical Examination.	Number of Cases in which Women signed the Voluntary Submission Form to attend for Medical Examination for a prescribed Period.	Number of Cases in which Women received a Magistrate's Order to attend for Medical Examination for a prescribed Period.	Number of Cases in which Women were Examined by the Visiting Surgeon, and found to be			Number of Cases in which Women were Discharged from Hospital cured, and still continued to follow former Pursuits.	Number of Cases in which Women were Discharged from Hospital, and returned to Friends, &c.	Number of Cases in which Women were Discharged from Hospital incurable.	Total Number of Individual Women remaining in Hospital.	Number of Cases in which Women were Proceeded against by Information before the Magistrates for Non-submission to Acts.	Number of Cases in which Women were Proceeded against by Summons for not attending Medical Examination after signing Voluntary Submission Form, or receiving Magistrate's Order to attend.	Number of Cases in which Women were Proceeded against by Summons for conducting themselves as Prostitutes after being Discharged from Hospital uncured.	Average Number of Women on the Register.	Annual Ratio per Cent. of Cases of Disease, calculated on the Average Number of Women on the Register.	Annual Ratio of Cases of Disease per 100 of Cases in which Women were on the Register.	Ratio of Cases of Disease per 100 of Examinations made by the Visiting Surgeons.		
			Free from Disease.	Diseased, and admitted into Hospital.	Total.													
(17.)	(18.)	(19.)	(20.)	(21.)	(22.)	(23.)	(24.)	(25.)	(26.)	(27.)	(28.)	(29.)	(30.)	(31.)	(32.)	(33.)		
30	-	-	12	18	30	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
355	-	-	147	368	515	296	43	-	40	-	-	-	215	171.16	-	71.45		
453	209	-	136	326	462	261	65	-	40	-	-	-	411	79.31	60.37	70.56		
533	1,061	-	361	477	838	372	76	9	60	-	-	-	491	97.14	69.23	56.92		
705	1,512	-	1,165	722	1,887	611	27	24	120	-	-	-	522	138.31	80.13	38.26		
1,040	1,874	3	8,195	842	9,037	704	117	26	115	27	1	-	704	119.60	73.92	9.31		
974	1,646	-	10,903	730	11,633	628	135	10	72	-	-	-	661	110.43	66.91	6.27		
878	1,532	1	10,292	633	10,925	555	77	2	71	1	-	-	592	106.92	62.73	5.79		
866	1,516	-	10,177	610	10,787	572	44	-	65	-	-	-	588	103.74	62.12	5.66		
871	1,302	-	10,552	442	10,994	371	76	2	58	-	-	-	569	77.68	45.01	4.02		
896	1,149	-	10,310	528	10,838	443	65	1	77	-	-	-	556	94.96	51.66	4.87		
203	-	-	-	202	202	97	67	-	33	-	-	-	(e) 45	594.11	-	101.00	(e) 40 weeks.	
345	114	-	11	345	356	225	77	19	62	-	-	-	142	242.95	87.34	96.91		
368	335	-	26	352	378	239	89	24	62	-	-	-	304	115.78	68.34	93.12		
1,334	2,236	3	1,380	1,388	2,768	1,134	144	21	151	6	2	-	769	180.49	92.34	50.14		
1,155	1,638	-	7,228	1,432	8,660	1,387	83	33	80	19	-	-	701	204.27	120.43	16.53		
916	1,134	22	9,525	868	10,393	848	33	4	63	32	11	-	612	141.83	89.11	8.35		
784	990	10	8,531	703	9,234	622	93	6	45	30	2	-	541	129.94	81.55	7.61		
743	1,023	-	8,574	706	9,280	582	97	-	72	-	2	-	487	144.97	87.48	7.60		
697	1,022	14	8,832	605	9,437	526	109	-	42	16	6	1	481	125.78	80.88	6.41		
658	1,272	3	8,634	556	9,190	429	105	-	64	4	-	-	458	121.40	79.09	6.05		
66	-	-	32	66	98	41	17	-	8	-	-	-	(f) 39	300.00	-	67.34	(f) 30 weeks.	
91	53	-	178	107	285	107	-	-	8	-	-	-	72	148.61	89.16	37.54		
94	94	-	275	58	333	49	9	1	7	-	-	-	61	95.08	51.78	17.26		
80	77	-	279	59	338	52	6	-	8	-	-	-	52	113.46	70.23	17.45		
89	83	-	314	93	407	63	20	-	13	-	-	-	51	182.35	104.49	22.85		
75	165	-	789	94	883	105	-	-	2	1	-	-	56	167.85	100.00	10.64		
78	94	-	1,217	36	1,253	38	-	-	2	-	1	-	58	62.06	38.70	2.87		
71	86	-	932	41	973	36	-	-	5	-	-	-	48	85.42	49.40	4.21		
64	77	-	810	28	838	29	3	-	1	1	1	-	39	71.79	35.90	3.34		
70	75	-	938	24	962	21	2	-	2	-	-	-	39	61.54	26.97	2.49		
216	-	-	65	147	212	135	-	-	32	-	-	-	(g) 107	249.15	-	69.33	(g) 29 weeks.	
309	164	-	162	277	439	256	21	-	32	-	-	-	273	101.46	88.78	63.09		
309	450	-	262	463	725	426	12	2	55	-	-	-	274	168.97	139.03	63.86		
308	466	-	973	686	1,659	612	85	1	43	-	-	-	254	270.07	201.17	41.35		
370	493	-	3,717	697	4,414	630	50	-	60	-	-	-	237	294.09	168.35	15.79		
550	533	-	5,276	396	5,672	390	22	-	44	-	-	-	316	125.31	66.11	6.98		
464	618	-	4,230	343	4,573	315	49	-	23	2	-	-	232	147.84	64.71	7.50		
357	612	-	2,787	452	3,239	395	34	-	46	-	-	-	196	230.61	95.76	13.95		
320	587	-	3,072	378	3,450	350	51	-	23	1	3	-	175	216.00	96.43	10.96		
369	685	-	3,871	360	4,231	335	34	-	14	1	3	-	193	186.53	84.31	8.51		
113	-	-	71	48	119	16	-	-	37	-	-	-	(h) 73	533.33	-	40.33	(h) 7 weeks.	
346	-	-	360	298	658	323	-	-	12	-	-	-	174	171.26	86.12	45.28		
385	-	-	769	488	1,257	395	55	-	50	-	-	-	219	222.83	126.75	38.82		
389	726	1	2,930	515	3,445	471	45	-	49	1	1	-	223	230.94	130.37	14.94		
349	584	-	3,955	342	4,297	284	67	2	38	1	2	-	199	171.85	83.61	7.95		
379	533	2	2,789	320	3,109	262	69	2	25	6	18	-	199	160.80	72.72	10.29		
312	398	4	2,374	234	2,608	197	48	-	14	4	16	-	188	124.47	65.55	8.97		
263	338	4	2,444	188	2,632	166	26	-	10	9	39	-	170	110.59	62.25	7.14		
272	365	3	2,885	198	3,083	150	39	2	17	5	39	-	163	121.47	61.87	6.42		
273	580	-	78	329	407	213	36	-	80	-	-	-	(i) 135	325.74	-	80.83	(i) 39 weeks.	
427	920	6	1,485	832	2,317	819	16	12	65	10	2	-	262	317.55	186.54	35.90		
498	964	-	5,060	754	5,814	757	28	1	33	-	-	-	313	240.89	144.16	12.96		
568	848	-	6,287	674	6,961	617	32	-	58	-	-	-	326	206.74	110.85	9.68		
469	893	-	4,745	632	5,377	553	96	1	40	-	-	-	256	246.87	112.85	11.75		
415	769	-	4,266	633	4,899	550	72	1	50	-	-	-	232	272.84	129.45	12.92		
402	837	-	4,111	730	4,841	671	67	-	42	-	-	-	231	316.02	158.70	15.08		
386	773	-	3,659	604	4,263	546	64	-	36	-	-	-	213	283.57	134.82	14.17		

RETURN showing the Number of known Common Women coming within

DISTRICTS.	Year.	REGISTRATIONS.							REMOVALS.					Total Number of Individual Women remaining on the Register.	Total Number of Known Common Women at the Time the Acts were first put into Operation ; as also the Number of Known Common Women on the 31st December of each succeeding Year.		
		Number of Individual Women Registered for the First Time during the Year.	Number of Cases in which Women, removed from the Register during the Year, were Re-registered.					Total Number of Individual Women Registered for the First Time during the Year, including each Case in which Women have been Re-registered.	Number of Individual Women remaining on the Register on the last Saturday of pre- ceding Year.	TOTAL.	Number of Cases in which Women were removed from the Register.						
			First Time.	Second Time.	Third Time.	Fourth Time.	Fifth Time.				Left the District.	Married.	Entered Homes.			Returned to Friends.	Died.
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)	(14.)	(15.)	(16.)
WINDSOR - - -	1868	87	3	1	-	-	-	91	-	91	15	1	-	6	1	68	54
	1869	44	5	2	-	-	-	51	68	119	32	-	11	16	-	60	60
	1870	15	7	5	1	-	-	28	60	88	31	5	9	9	4	30	30
	1871	27	7	1	-	-	-	35	30	65	24	-	8	5	1	27	27
	1872	19	5	-	-	-	-	24	27	51	17	2	-	3	1	28	28
	1873	20	2	-	-	-	-	22	28	50	19	-	1	5	1	24	24
	1874	15	4	1	-	-	-	20	24	44	16	1	6	1	3	17	17
SHORNCLIFFE - -	1868	119	-	-	-	-	-	119	-	119	31	7	3	6	-	72	70
	1869	78	-	-	-	-	-	78	72	150	43	3	12	24	4	64	64
	1870	53	12	-	-	-	-	65	64	129	57	5	9	12	-	46	46
	1871	59	5	-	-	-	-	64	46	110	53	2	-	11	-	44	44
	1872	47	6	2	-	-	-	55	44	99	33	1	5	15	1	44	44
	1873	39	8	-	-	-	-	47	44	91	32	1	4	16	-	38	38
	1874	34	12	3	-	-	-	49	38	87	39	1	4	16	1	26	26
COLCHESTER - -	1869	158	-	-	-	-	-	158	-	158	34	5	7	21	1	90	158
	1870	58	3	-	-	-	-	61	90	151	30	7	16	23	1	74	74
	1871	53	11	1	-	-	-	65	74	139	40	2	12	32	2	51	51
	1872	47	9	-	-	-	-	56	51	107	17	1	12	29	3	45	45
	1873	41	-	-	-	-	-	41	45	86	13	3	6	22	1	41	41
	1874	43	12	-	-	-	-	55	41	96	19	3	15	22	-	37	37
GREENWICH - -	1870	244	25	-	-	-	-	269	-	269	69	1	13	45	-	141	151
	1871	63	31	2	-	-	-	101	141	242	76	3	11	43	5	104	104
	1872	71	9	-	-	-	-	80	104	184	34	9	15	29	4	93	93
	1873	76	12	-	-	-	-	88	93	181	38	6	2	37	2	96	96
	1874	65	14	1	-	-	-	80	96	176	33	4	9	36	2	92	92
WINCHESTER - -	1870	143	15	1	-	-	-	159	-	159	66	2	9	33	-	49	76
	1871	52	12	1	-	-	-	65	49	114	42	2	18	11	2	39	39
	1872	42	10	1	-	-	-	53	39	92	35	2	4	11	1	39	39
	1873	35	11	-	-	-	-	46	39	85	39	2	5	13	-	26	26
	1874	44	15	1	-	-	-	60	26	86	35	-	3	14	1	33	33
DOVER - - -	1870	170	29	5	-	-	-	204	-	204	79	3	4	22	1	95	92
	1871	50	21	1	-	-	-	72	95	167	60	6	11	21	2	67	67
	1872	62	18	2	-	-	-	82	67	149	61	2	6	19	5	56	56
	1873	62	12	1	-	-	-	75	56	131	45	4	4	18	1	59	59
	1874	39	13	-	-	-	-	52	59	111	39	1	6	10	1	54	54
CANTERBURY - -	1870	117	6	-	-	-	-	123	-	123	48	3	8	21	1	42	42
	1871	52	12	3	-	-	-	67	42	109	49	-	1	9	-	50	50
	1872	29	9	2	-	-	-	40	50	90	42	1	2	10	-	35	35
	1873	39	6	-	-	-	-	45	35	80	30	-	1	20	-	29	29
	1874	43	8	1	-	-	-	52	29	81	29	2	4	11	1	34	34
DEAL - - -	1870	44	7	1	-	-	-	52	-	52	20	2	1	14	-	15	26
	1871	33	11	-	-	-	-	44	15	59	29	-	1	5	-	24	24
	1872	31	7	-	-	-	-	38	24	62	26	-	2	9	1	24	24
	1873	23	8	-	-	-	-	31	24	55	26	1	-	8	-	20	20
	1874	18	5	-	-	-	-	23	20	43	25	1	-	5	1	11	11
MAIDSTONE - -	1870	80	11	-	-	-	-	91	-	91	42	1	4	3	1	40	58
	1871	24	9	-	-	-	-	33	40	73	28	-	3	8	-	34	34
	1872	18	14	-	-	-	-	32	34	66	29	1	-	6	-	30	30
	1873	41	4	-	-	-	-	45	30	75	33	1	2	12	-	27	27
	1874	38	7	-	-	-	-	45	27	72	27	1	3	14	3	24	24
GRAVESEND - -	1870	117	11	1	-	-	-	129	-	129	72	1	3	12	1	40	47
	1871	62	11	1	-	-	-	74	40	114	54	1	6	14	1	38	38
	1872	46	14	2	-	-	-	62	38	100	44	4	2	18	-	32	32
	1873	40	6	1	-	-	-	47	32	79	32	-	3	14	-	30	30
	1874	45	8	-	-	-	-	53	30	83	34	3	-	15	-	31	31
SOUTHAMPTON	1870	212	7	-	-	-	-	219	-	219	37	2	3	19	3	155	154
	1871	92	23	1	-	-	-	116	155	271	62	5	5	34	5	160	160
	1872	90	25	-	-	-	-	115	160	275	56	3	6	39	2	169	169
	1873	114	35	1	-	-	-	150	169	319	67	3	8	73	5	163	163
	1874	80	29	2	-	-	-	111	163	274	75	6	3	50	2	138	138

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS, FOR 1874.

the Provisions of the Contagious Diseases Acts, &c.—continued.

MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.						HOSPITAL.				SUMMONSES.				PER-CENTAGES.				REMARKS.
Number of Individual Women which attended for Medical Examination.	Number of Cases in which Women signed the Voluntary Submission Form to attend for Medical Examination for a prescribed Period.	Number of Cases in which Women received a Magistrate's Order to attend for Medical Examination for a prescribed Period.	Number of Cases in which Women were Examined by the Visiting Surgeon and found to be	Free from Disease.	Diseased, and admitted into Hospital.	Total.	Number of Cases in which Women were Discharged from Hospital cured, and still continued to follow former Pursuits.	Number of Cases in which Women were Discharged from Hospital, and returned to Friends, &c.	Number of Cases in which Women were Discharged from Hospital incurable.	Total Number of Individual Women remaining in Hospital.	Number of Cases in which Women were Proceeded against by Information before the Magistrates for Non-submission to Acts.	Number of Cases in which Women were Proceeded against by Summons for not attending Medical Examination after signing Voluntary Submission Form, or receiving Magistrate's Order to attend.	Number of Cases in which Women were Proceeded against by Summons for conducting themselves as Prostitutes after being Discharged from Hospital incurable.	Average Number of Women on the Register.	Annual Ratio per Cent. of Cases of Disease, calculated on the Average Number of Women on the Register.	Annual Ratio of Cases of Disease per 100 of Cases in which Women were on the Register.	Ratio of Cases of Disease per 100 of Examinations made by the Visiting Surgeons.	
(17.)	(18.)	(19.)	(20.)	(21.)	(22.)	(23.)	(24.)	(25.)	(26.)	(27.)	(28.)	(29.)	(30.)	(31.)	(32.)	(33.)		
1	87	160	-	173	87	260	53	13	-	16	-	-	(j) 59	207.14	-	33.46	(j) 39 weeks	
2	105	114	-	427	84	511	77	15	-	8	-	1	62	135.48	70.58	16.43		
3	71	80	-	590	52	642	43	11	-	6	-	-	43	120.93	59.09	8.09		
4	52	77	-	534	39	573	37	5	-	3	-	-	29	134.48	60.00	6.80		
5	43	63	-	511	33	544	31	-	-	5	-	-	28	117.86	64.71	6.07		
6	45	47	-	482	22	504	22	2	-	3	-	1	25	88.00	44.00	4.36		
7	36	35	-	430	15	445	12	3	-	3	-	-	22	68.18	34.09	3.37		
8	119	187	-	381	101	432	78	8	-	15	-	-	(k) 76	315.62	-	20.95	(k) 22 weeks	
9	150	267	1	782	208	990	175	27	2	19	1	3	74	281.08	138.66	21.01		
10	117	143	-	819	82	901	78	9	1	13	-	3	53	154.71	63.56	9.10		
11	105	153	-	741	76	817	79	6	-	4	2	2	48	158.33	69.09	9.30		
12	89	131	-	687	87	774	78	7	1	5	-	1	47	185.11	87.88	11.24		
13	80	112	-	949	63	1,012	57	7	-	4	-	2	49	128.57	69.23	6.23		
14	71	88	-	705	33	738	28	9	-	-	-	-	36	91.67	37.93	4.47		
15	158	242	3	862	142	1,004	86	45	1	10	3	2	(l) 90	171.08	-	14.14	(l) 48 weeks	
16	143	214	-	1,581	91	1,672	77	17	1	6	-	-	84	108.33	60.26	5.44		
17	115	142	-	1,059	77	1,136	57	21	-	5	-	-	62	124.19	55.39	6.77		
18	95	142	-	782	83	865	57	25	-	6	-	-	48	172.92	77.57	9.60		
19	82	111	1	791	76	867	58	17	-	7	1	-	47	161.70	88.37	8.77		
20	79	98	-	760	63	823	38	23	-	9	-	-	42	150.00	65.63	7.65		
21	244	374	5	2,569	204	2,773	143	53	-	8	6	14	(m) 145	140.68	-	7.35	(m) 52 weeks	
22	199	298	5	1,674	78	1,752	55	26	-	5	17	50	121	64.46	32.23	4.44		
23	159	401	9	1,261	66	1,327	51	15	-	5	13	35	100	66.00	35.87	4.97		
24	151	261	5	1,447	76	1,523	68	6	-	7	9	47	99	76.77	41.99	4.99		
25	147	242	1	1,739	76	1,815	60	15	-	8	2	45	96	79.17	43.18	4.19		
26	140	264	-	1,039	163	1,202	135	17	-	11	-	-	(n) 54	301.85	-	13.56	(n) 52 weeks	
27	98	148	-	1,009	109	1,118	105	12	-	3	-	-	47	231.91	95.61	9.74		
28	76	88	-	851	51	902	40	10	-	4	1	1	40	127.50	55.43	5.65		
29	65	52	-	726	34	760	28	9	-	1	-	2	36	94.44	40.00	4.47		
30	70	69	-	727	28	755	13	13	-	3	1	8	32	87.50	32.56	3.71		
31	170	347	4	1,474	180	1,654	150	19	-	11	4	9	(o) 102	183.67	-	10.88	(o) 50 weeks	
32	135	189	1	1,201	105	1,306	112	-	-	4	1	3	79	132.90	62.87	8.03		
33	143	197	2	1,070	124	1,194	114	6	-	8	4	4	68	182.35	83.22	10.39		
34	112	211	-	1,008	117	1,125	118	4	-	3	1	10	63	185.71	89.31	10.40		
35	93	157	1	999	85	1,084	79	7	-	2	1	9	59	144.07	76.58	7.84		
36	117	131	12	404	74	478	41	22	1	10	15	38	(p) 41	189.74	-	15.48	(p) 50 weeks	
37	90	134	-	668	79	747	64	9	1	15	-	2	44	179.54	72.47	10.57		
38	71	96	1	463	62	525	66	5	-	6	1	7	41	151.22	68.89	11.81		
39	66	110	-	453	72	525	64	10	-	4	1	6	33	218.18	90.00	13.71		
40	69	106	-	564	59	623	55	4	-	4	-	1	33	178.79	72.84	9.41		
41	44	88	-	317	54	371	51	3	-	-	-	1	(q) 22	270.00	-	14.55	(q) 48 weeks	
42	46	83	-	388	48	436	46	-	-	2	-	-	24	200.00	81.35	11.00		
43	59	91	-	426	57	483	53	1	-	5	-	-	26	219.23	91.94	11.80		
44	45	97	-	358	70	428	71	1	-	3	-	-	24	291.67	127.27	16.36		
45	38	65	-	296	52	348	55	-	-	-	-	-	19	273.68	120.93	14.94		
46	80	120	-	637	60	697	50	7	-	3	3	7	(r) 45	150.00	-	8.60	(r) 46 weeks	
47	63	89	6	599	37	636	37	3	-	-	8	13	35	105.71	50.68	5.81		
48	50	82	-	301	61	362	50	3	-	8	-	-	28	217.86	92.42	16.85		
49	68	110	-	329	83	412	75	13	-	3	-	3	28	296.43	110.67	20.15		
50	59	76	1	358	49	407	44	6	-	2	2	4	*26	213.04	68.06	12.04		
51	109	178	-	924	92	1,016	76	9	-	7	-	-	(s) 59	176.92	-	9.05	(s) 46 weeks	
52	96	131	-	772	72	844	60	17	-	2	-	-	45	160.00	63.15	8.53		
53	82	117	-	427	93	520	77	12	-	6	-	-	39	238.46	93.00	17.88		
54	68	99	-	475	65	540	58	9	-	4	-	3	33	196.97	82.28	12.04		
55	70	130	1	558	84	642	72	5	-	11	1	1	35	240.00	101.20	13.08		
56	212	273	6	989	136	1,125	103	8	5	20	23	42	(t) 159	140.20	-	12.08	(t) 32 weeks	
57	210	338	11	2,115	90	2,205	84	9	-	17	39	50	155	58.00	33.21	4.08		
58	238	544	4	2,100	91	2,191	71	16	1	20	10	3	167	54.49	33.09	4.15		
59	270	498	9	2,157	166	2,323	132	32	3	19	23	52	167	99.40	52.04	7.15		
60	240	543	4	2,371	167	2,538	152	23	1	10	14	37	152	109.87	60.95	6.58		

* 46 weeks only. Fever at Examination House last 6 weeks of the year.

— No. 2. —

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN showing the AGES of Known Common Women in the several Districts at the Time the Acts were first put in Operation; as also the AGES of Known Common Women on the 31st December of each succeeding Year.

YEAR.	A G E S.												TOTAL.
	12 and under 13.	13 and under 14.	14 and under 15.	15 and under 16.	16 and under 17.	17 and under 18.	18 and under 19.	19 and under 20.	20 and under 21.	21 and under 26.	26 and under 31.	31 and over.	
	(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	
1865	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*3,418
1866	2	2	27	104	242	218	254	279	324	795	267	99	*2,613
1867	1	3	24	50	133	199	289	320	351	853	269	87	*2,579
1868	-	1	18	37	98	196	310	307	420	804	215	101	*2,507
1869	-	2	11	33	77	135	213	212	415	977	319	163	*2,557
1870	-	1	1	19	53	136	216	233	264	1,169	425	202	*2,719
1871	-	-	-	6	37	61	127	225	281	1,036	426	212	*2,411
1872	-	-	1	-	8	58	119	180	245	1,038	450	191	*2,290
1873	-	-	-	2	9	51	101	162	213	936	437	210	2,121
1874	-	-	1	5	11	51	102	144	158	882	476	242	2,072

* For the number of common women known to have been in the several districts on the 31st December of each year (see Form No. 1, Column 16).

Note (1).—The entire number of known common women was not apparently obtained for the Chatham, Aldershot, and Windsor Districts until the Acts were fully developed, and the whole of the common women in these districts had been registered and brought under the operation of the Acts; the registration of the women only taking place as hospital accommodation was provided.

(2).—The first total in column 13 signifies the number of known common women in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, and Chatham Districts at the time when the Contagious Diseases Acts were first put in operation; this information was obtained by inquiry and observation of the police. In Portsmouth the number was obtained from the borough police, but as no "Register of Ages" was kept at that time, the ages of the 1,355 women for this district cannot be given. The succeeding totals show the number of known common women on the 31st of December of each year in the old districts, adding the ages of those common women known to have been in each new district at the time the Acts were extended thereto.

(3).—In the year 1865, the Acts were but partially in operation in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, and Chatham Districts, and the operation of the Acts was, to a certain extent, hindered by the great want of hospital accommodation; no perceptible reduction being observed, at these places, during the year in the total number of known common women, which still remained at 3,418.

To arrive at a correct conclusion as to the reduction which has taken place from year to year in the number of known common women, the number in each new district at the time the Acts were extended thereto must be added to those known to have been in the older districts on the 31st of December of the previous year.

In 1866 the Woolwich District was included; by taking the number of known common women in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, and Chatham Districts, viz., 3,418, and adding thereto the 240 women belonging to Woolwich, the number would be increased to 3,658 common women known to have been in these districts during the year 1866; such, however, was the immediate effects of the more complete development of the Acts, that the number of known common women in these districts was found, on the 31st December of that year, i.e. 1866, to have been reduced to 2,613.

Aldershot, with 266 women, was included during the year 1867; this increased the number (2,613) to 2,879, as against the reduced number of 2,579 on the 31st December 1867. The districts of Windsor with 54 women, and Shorncliffe with 70, were included during the year 1868; these numbers added to the 2,579 common women known to have been in the older districts on the 31st December 1867, increases the number to 2,703, but the number was reduced to 2,523 on the 31st December of that year, and this, too, notwithstanding an increase in the numbers in some of the districts (vide Note 1).

The Colchester District, with 158 known common women, was included during the year 1869, and by adding this number to the 2,523 common women known to have been in the older districts on the 31st December 1868, the number is increased to 2,681, as against the reduced number of 2,489 on the 31st December 1869.

During the year 1870 the following districts were included: Greenwich with 151 known common women, Winchester 76, Dover 92, Canterbury 42, Deal 26, Maidstone 58, Gravesend 47, and Southampton 154; the total of these numbers (646) added to the 2,489 common women known to have been in the older districts, on the 31st December 1869, increases that number to 3,135, as against the reduced number of 2,650 known common women in the various districts on the 31st December 1870.

The Acts have not been extended since 1870, but a steady diminution in the numbers has nevertheless taken place; the number of known common women at the end of the year 1871 being 2,411, as against 2,650 on the 31st December 1870; 2,290 on the 31st December 1872; 2,121 on the 31st December 1873; and on the 31st December 1874, the total number of all the known common women in the several districts had decreased to 2,072.

(4).—The reduction in the number of known common women in the various districts at the present time (as compared with the number of known common women practising prostitution in each respective district at the time the Acts were first put in operation) is from 4,852 to 2,072, thus showing a decrease of 2,780 to have been effected (in the places named) since the Acts have been in operation. The reduction which has taken place each year is as follows:

1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
The Acts not fully developed.	1,045	300	180	192	485	239	121	169	49

This forms the total decrease of 2,780.

No. 2—continued.

RETURN showing the AGES of KNOWN COMMON WOMEN in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, Chatham, Woolwich, Aldershot, Windsor, Shorncliffe, Colchester, Greenwich, Winchester, Dover, Canterbury, Deal, Maidstone, Gravesend, and Southampton Districts, at the Time the Acts were first put in Operation; as also the AGES of KNOWN COMMON WOMEN on the 31st December of each succeeding Year.

DISTRICTS.	YEAR.	A G E S.												TOTAL.
		12 and under 13.	13 and under 14.	14 and under 15.	15 and under 16.	16 and under 17.	17 and under 18.	18 and under 19.	19 and under 20.	20 and under 21.	21 and under 26.	26 and under 31.	31 and over.	
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)
PORTSMOUTH	1865	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,355
	1866	-	2	13	16	35	72	104	121	152	204	39	31	789
	1867	-	2	9	10	23	83	124	126	180	188	32	21	748
	1868	-	-	4	8	38	98	139	123	117	173	24	15	739
	1869	-	2	9	23	46	65	88	64	172	185	35	41	730
	1870	-	-	1	12	34	64	68	53	61	205	50	41	590
	1871	-	-	-	5	27	25	60	75	108	190	57	39	586
	1872	-	-	1	-	2	18	38	65	67	261	88	40	580
	1873	-	-	-	-	2	20	27	47	63	272	86	41	558
	1874	-	-	1	3	5	30	43	31	37	264	93	48	555
DEVONPORT	1865	2	12	109	89	207	227	184	230	189	344	137	40	1,770
	1866	2	-	13	88	201	108	101	110	101	342	130	42	1,238
	1867	-	-	15	34	102	75	92	113	118	309	123	29	1,010
	1868	-	1	14	22	45	62	87	89	178	228	70	33	829
	1869	-	-	2	2	16	18	25	36	116	302	98	47	662
	1870	-	-	-	1	3	13	17	19	25	336	89	54	557
	1871	-	-	-	-	1	9	17	24	35	279	84	54	503
	1872	-	-	-	-	1	9	15	21	32	246	102	48	474
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	5	10	23	25	186	134	64	447
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	2	12	21	23	162	165	67	452
SHEERNESS	1865	-	-	-	-	-	4	6	9	6	23	15	5	73
	1866	-	-	-	-	-	3	5	6	8	22	17	6	67
	1867	-	-	-	-	1	1	2	4	8	23	11	10	60
	1868	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	4	3	18	14	8	52
	1869	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	7	5	25	14	9	66
	1870	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	5	8	23	12	8	59
	1871	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	2	4	24	14	7	54
	1872	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	4	14	13	6	42
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	19	9	7	38
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	1	17	12	8	42
CHATHAM	1865	-	-	-	-	3	9	18	22	25	82	49	12	220
	1866	-	-	-	-	4	21	32	29	27	114	40	12	279
	1867	-	-	-	-	2	16	38	21	24	108	43	13	265
	1868	-	-	-	-	3	10	31	23	28	96	32	15	238
	1869	-	-	-	-	2	15	35	30	25	119	45	16	287
	1870	-	-	-	-	2	14	39	32	22	97	64	11	281
	1871	-	-	-	-	1	2	10	20	25	81	54	10	203
	1872	-	-	-	-	1	4	15	16	34	74	38	10	192
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	12	16	76	43	21	172
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	10	16	89	41	30	190
WOOLWICH	1866	-	-	1	-	2	14	12	13	36	113	41	8	240
	1867	1	1	-	2	3	16	11	24	34	100	31	7	230
	1868	-	-	-	2	2	10	15	22	31	113	24	14	233
	1869	-	-	-	1	-	12	18	18	21	107	27	11	215
	1870	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	18	22	93	52	8	197
	1871	-	-	-	-	1	3	3	18	23	82	58	12	200
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5	20	82	46	15	172
	1873	-	-	-	1	-	2	8	7	19	65	35	10	147
	1874	-	-	-	-	1	3	6	10	11	68	37	13	149
ALDERSHOT	1867	-	-	-	4	2	8	22	32	37	125	29	7	266
	1868	-	-	-	4	7	12	25	31	48	122	34	9	292
	1869	-	-	-	4	8	12	23	26	37	132	58	15	315
	1870	-	-	-	-	4	8	20	16	26	116	40	9	239
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	2	6	23	19	111	50	16	227
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	5	11	17	25	109	56	12	235
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	6	18	21	21	93	38	9	206
	1874	-	-	-	-	3	5	14	31	23	73	25	13	187
WINDSOR	1868	-	-	-	1	1	1	6	6	5	23	8	3	54
	1869	-	-	-	1	2	1	5	7	7	20	14	3	60
	1870	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	13	9	4	30
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	11	8	4	27
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	6	7	8	6	28
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	3	6	7	4	24
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	4	2	3	2	4	17

No. 2.—RETURN showing the Ages of Known Common Women in the undermentioned Districts—*continued*.

DISTRICTS.	YEAR.	A G E S.												TOTAL.
		12 and under 13.	13 and under 14.	14 and under 15.	15 and under 16.	16 and under 17.	17 and under 18.	18 and under 19.	19 and under 20.	20 and under 21.	21 and under 26.	26 and under 31.	31 and over.	
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)
SHORNCLIFFE -	1868	-	-	-	-	1	2	4	9	10	31	9	4	70
	1869	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	5	12	29	7	7	64
	1870	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	5	6	18	8	6	46
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	7	26	5	5	44
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	3	20	14	2	44
	1873	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	9	14	9	4	38
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	12	10	3	26
COLCHESTER -	1869	-	-	-	2	3	8	13	19	20	58	21	14	158
	1870	-	-	-	-	1	3	5	7	13	33	5	7	74
	1871	-	-	-	-	2	3	3	3	3	25	7	5	51
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	5	5	17	8	4	45
	1873	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	6	5	13	7	5	41
	1874	-	-	-	1	-	2	2	5	5	11	7	4	37
GREENWICH -	1870	-	-	-	3	-	4	17	16	16	47	27	21	151
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	8	10	35	25	21	104
	1872	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	5	8	42	14	20	93
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	8	9	42	15	16	96
	1874	-	-	-	-	2	2	5	8	8	35	16	16	92
WINCHESTER -	1870	-	1	-	2	-	9	10	12	2	26	9	5	76
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	4	19	7	4	39
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	20	8	4	39
	1873	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	1	2	14	3	1	26
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	16	10	3	33
DOVER - - -	1870	-	-	-	-	-	4	8	10	14	39	12	5	92
	1871	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	6	7	31	10	8	67
	1872	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	4	6	23	13	6	56
	1873	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	4	4	26	11	8	59
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	3	3	17	18	8	54
CANTERBURY -	1870	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2	20	11	4	42
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	5	10	18	9	2	50
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	5	1	17	3	4	35
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	5	15	2	3	29
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	4	2	19	4	3	34
DEAL - - -	1870	-	-	-	-	2	3	-	4	2	14	1	-	26
	1871	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	2	4	9	3	-	22
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	7	5	8	1	-	24
	1873	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	2	5	7	3	-	20
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	4	3	-	11
MAIDSTONE -	1870	-	-	-	-	1	2	6	6	11	17	8	7	58
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	21	7	2	34
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	3	2	14	4	1	30
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	7	7	5	1	27
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	3	11	5	1	24
GRAVESEND -	1870	-	-	-	-	1	2	5	7	8	10	7	7	47
	1871	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	5	5	14	2	10	38
	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	1	19	5	3	32
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	18	5	3	30
	1874	-	-	-	1	-	-	5	1	5	13	3	3	31
SOUTHAMPTON -	1870	-	-	-	-	4	7	14	18	24	62	21	4	154
	1871	-	-	-	-	2	5	15	24	15	60	26	13	160
	1872	-	-	-	-	1	10	17	16	21	65	29	10	169
	1873	-	-	-	-	2	8	15	21	16	63	25	13	163
	1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	10	13	68	25	18	138

— No. 3. —

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN showing the Number of PUBLIC HOUSES, BEER HOUSES, and BROTHELS in the several Districts on the 31st December of each Year, during which the Acts have been in Operation.

YEAR.	PUBLIC HOUSES				BEER HOUSES				Licensed to sell Beer not to be Drunk on the Premises.*	BROTHELS.					
	Where Common Women Resided, and were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Where Common Women did not Reside, but were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.	Where Common Women Resided, and were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Where Common Women did not Reside, but were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.		Public Houses.	Beer Houses.	Private Houses in which Women Resided, and practised Prostitution.	Private Houses in which Accommodation was indiscriminately provided to all Corners for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.
	(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)	(14.)	(15.)
1865	57	26	960	1,043	179	17	1,163	1,359	49	88	196	436	22	12	749
1866	61	28	1,089	1,178	167	21	1,225	1,413	43	89	188	444	21	17	759
1867	56	22	1,319	1,397	177	17	1,325	1,519	43	78	194	352	33	24	681
1868	64	24	1,509	1,597	176	19	1,460	1,655	41	88	195	334	32	20	669
1869	46	24	1,599	1,669	65	20	1,570	1,655	70	70	85	402	35	20	612
1870	72	41	2,805	2,918	60	19	2,311	2,390	97	113	79	567	101	20	880
1871	71	27	2,741	2,839	31	9	2,293	2,333	90	98	40	526	102	23	789
1872	54	27	2,756	2,837	22	9	2,208	2,239	103	81	31	464	98	29	703
1873	34	17	2,795	2,846	13	4	2,187	2,204	108	51	17	474	82	62	686
1874	28	16	2,816	2,860	11	1	2,130	2,142	124	44	12	451	55	39	601

* The numbers shown in this column are not included in the numbers shown in column 8.

Note (1).—In the year 1865 the Acts were only in operation at Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, and Chatham, and the numbers for these districts on the 31st December of the year were 1,043 public-houses, 1,359 beerhouses, and 749 brothels. In 1866 the Woolwich District was included, and this increased the numbers to 1,159 public-houses, 1,452 beerhouses, and 845 brothels, as having been in these five districts on the 31st December of the first year during which the Acts were extended to each of these respective districts. Aldershot was included in 1867, increasing the number to 1,383 public-houses, 1,588 beerhouses, and 899 brothels. The districts of Windsor and Shorncliffe were included in 1868, increasing the numbers to 1,566 public-houses, 1,728 beerhouses, and 934 brothels; Colchester was included in 1869, increasing the numbers to 1,672 public-houses, 1,778 beerhouses, and 961 brothels. During the year 1870, the following districts were included, viz.: Greenwich, Winchester, Dover, Canterbury, Deal, Maidstone, Gravesend, and Southampton, thereby making the totals of these houses known to have been in the various districts on the 31st of December of the first year the Acts were put in operation at each respective district, to be 2,839 public-houses, 2,510 beerhouses, and 1,279 brothels. The Acts have not been extended since 1870.

The total number of public-houses, beerhouses, and brothels respectively known to have been in the various districts on the 31st December of the first year the Acts were put in operation at each respective district, and the number of public-houses and beerhouses known to have been used as brothels, should be compared with the numbers at the present time as under:—

	Public-Houses.	Beer Houses.	Brothels.	Public Houses used as Brothels.	Beer Houses used as Brothels.	REMARKS.
Total in the various Districts on the 31st December of the first year the Acts were extended to each District.	2,839	2,510	1,279	152	263	
Total in the various Districts on the 31st December 1874.	2,860	2,142	601	44	12	
Up to the present time { Increase - - -	21	—	—	—	—	Notwithstanding the increase of population.
Decrease - - -	—	368	678	108	251	

The figures under the headings "Total" signify the number of Public Houses, Beer Houses, and Brothels respectively in the various Districts where the Acts were in operation on the 31st December of each year, and were obtained by information from the local authorities, and special observation of the Police employed under the Contagious Diseases Acts.

To properly perceive the result effected from year to year with regard to these Houses since the first introduction of the Acts, the numbers in each new District on the 31st December of the first year the Acts were extended must be added to the numbers known to have been in the Old Districts on the 31st December of the previous year, and the Totals thereof compared with the numbers known to have been in the whole of the Districts of the 31st December of the following year; by pursuing this course the result effected will be clearly illustrated, and found to be as follows:—

	1865.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	REMARKS.
PUBLIC HOUSES:											
Increase - - -	—	19	—	17	—	82	—	—	9	14	Thus showing an increase of only 21 Public Houses up to the present time.
Decrease - - -	—	—	5	—	34	—	79	2	—	—	
BEER HOUSES:											
Increase - - -	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	Thus showing a decrease of 368 Beer Houses up to the present time.
Decrease - - -	—	39	30	4	50	—	57	94	35	62	
BROTHELS:											
Increase - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Thus showing a decrease of 678 Brothels up to the present time.
Decrease - - -	—	86	132	47	84	50	91	86	17	85	
PUBLIC HOUSES USED AS BROTHELS:											
Increase - - -	—	6	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	Thus showing a decrease of 108 Public Houses, used as Brothels, up to the present time.
Decrease - - -	—	—	13	—	22	11	15	17	30	7	
BEER HOUSES USED AS BROTHELS:											
Increase - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Thus showing a decrease of 251 Beer Houses, used as Brothels up to the present time.
Decrease - - -	—	8	13	18	118	27	39	9	14	5	

No. 3—continued.

RETURN showing the Number of PUBLIC HOUSES, BEER HOUSES, and BROTHELS in the *Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, Chatham, Woolwich, Aldershot, Windsor, Shorncliffe, Colchester, Greenwich, Winchester, Dover, Canterbury, Deal, Maidstone, Gravesend, and Southampton* Districts, on the 31st December of each Year during which the Acts have been in Operation.

DISTRICTS.	Year.	PUBLIC HOUSES				BEER HOUSES					BROTHELS.					
		Where Common Women Resided, and were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Where Common Women did not Reside, but were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.	Where Common Women Resided, and were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Where Common Women did not Reside, but were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.	Licensed to sell Beer not to be Drunk on the Premises.*	Public Houses.	Beer Houses.	Private Houses in which Women Resided and practised Prostitution.	Private Houses in which Accommodation was indiscriminately provided to all Comers for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)	(14.)	(15.)
PORTSMOUTH	1865	13	10	341	364	57	4	633	694	21	23	61	160	10	9	263
	1866	13	10	374	397	57	4	605	666	14	23	61	150	9	10	253
	1867	10	10	389	409	49	3	588	640	14	20	52	101	15	14	202
	1868	9	9	398	416	45	4	588	637	15	18	49	110	14	13	204
	1869	3	9	403	415	8	2	668	678	17	12	10	145	12	14	193
	1870	-	9	402	411	2	2	628	632	8	9	4	156	16	10	195
	1871	-	7	406	413	-	1	629	630	10	7	1	154	15	9	186
	1872	-	6	405	411	-	-	623	623	14	6	-	155	16	11	188
	1873	-	3	402	405	-	-	618	618	17	3	-	144	13	9	169
	1874	-	3	413	416	-	-	600	600	29	3	-	121	12	8	144
DEVONPORT	1865	14	4	409	427	94	8	356	458	22	18	102	226	10	-	356
	1866	16	6	301	413	82	12	353	447	25	22	94	157	7	-	280
	1867	12	2	381	395	82	10	345	437	23	14	92	92	8	-	206
	1868	13	4	379	396	66	7	357	430	21	17	73	69	11	-	170
	1869	4	4	348	356	10	8	362	380	23	8	18	95	10	-	131
	1870	-	5	413	418	5	7	408	420	22	5	12	94	10	-	121
	1871	-	-	325	325	-	-	390	390	24	-	-	121	9	-	130
	1872	1	-	332	333	-	-	342	342	30	1	-	96	11	-	108
	1873	-	-	336	336	-	-	343	343	31	-	-	97	9	-	106
	1874	-	-	338	338	-	-	330	330	34	-	-	89	9	-	98
SHEERNESS	1865	2	2	48	52	3	1	25	29	-	4	4	5	2	3	18
	1866	4	2	46	52	3	1	26	30	-	6	4	3	2	3	18
	1867	4	1	48	53	3	1	32	36	-	5	4	4	2	3	18
	1868	4	1	49	54	3	1	30	34	-	5	4	4	1	3	17
	1869	3	1	50	54	3	1	21	25	-	4	4	2	1	3	14
	1870	-	-	52	52	-	-	31	31	-	-	-	20	1	3	24
	1871	-	-	52	52	-	-	31	31	-	-	-	16	1	3	20
	1872	-	-	53	53	-	-	28	28	1	-	-	15	1	3	19
	1873	-	-	53	53	-	-	28	28	1	-	-	12	1	5	18
	1874	-	-	53	53	-	-	25	25	1	-	-	13	-	2	15
CHATHAM	1865	28	10	162	200	25	4	149	178	6	38	29	45	-	-	112
	1866	28	10	162	200	25	4	148	177	4	38	29	45	-	-	112
	1867	28	9	163	200	25	2	149	176	5	37	27	59	-	-	123
	1868	28	9	163	200	25	2	149	176	4	37	27	61	-	-	125
	1869	28	7	166	201	23	1	151	175	5	35	24	69	-	-	128
	1870	28	8	165	201	23	-	150	173	5	36	23	57	-	-	116
	1871	27	9	165	201	13	-	160	173	5	36	13	31	-	-	81
	1872	27	10	155	192	11	1	175	187	5	37	12	16	-	1	68
	1873	17	9	172	198	9	1	178	188	5	26	10	43	-	4	83
	1874	15	6	173	194	7	-	178	185	5	21	7	41	-	3	72
WOOLWICH	1866	-	-	116	116	-	-	93	93	-	-	-	89	3	4	96
	1867	-	-	116	116	-	-	94	94	1	-	-	67	4	7	78
	1868	-	-	116	116	1	1	95	97	1	-	2	63	1	4	70
	1869	-	-	116	116	1	1	85	87	1	-	-	45	3	3	53
	1870	-	-	134	134	-	-	96	96	2	-	-	47	3	3	53
	1871	-	-	134	134	-	-	95	95	2	-	-	40	2	8	50
	1872	-	-	132	132	-	-	92	92	2	-	-	41	2	10	53
	1873	-	-	130	130	-	-	89	89	-	-	-	43	2	10	55
	1874	-	-	130	130	-	-	86	86	-	-	-	40	1	10	51
ALDERSHOT	1867	2	-	222	224	18	1	117	136	-	2	19	29	4	-	54
	1868	2	-	230	232	18	3	120	141	-	2	21	20	5	-	48
	1869	2	-	235	237	16	2	130	148	-	2	18	21	5	-	46
	1870	2	-	240	242	15	2	121	138	-	2	17	11	5	-	35
	1871	2	-	243	245	12	2	115	129	-	2	14	12	5	-	33
	1872	-	2	243	245	6	2	119	127	-	2	8	15	7	-	32
	1873	1	-	245	246	2	-	120	122	-	1	2	34	4	-	41
	1874	-	-	247	247	-	-	122	122	1	-	-	33	2	2	37
WINDSOR	1868	-	1	88	89	10	1	95	106	-	1	11	3	-	-	15
	1869	-	-	88	88	-	-	89	89	-	-	-	7	-	-	7
	1870	-	-	84	84	-	-	93	93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1871	-	-	84	84	-	-	93	93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1872	-	-	84	84	-	-	93	93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	-	-	84	84	-	-	93	93	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874	-	-	84	84	-	-	93	93	-	-	-	3	-	-	3

* The numbers shown in this column are not included in the numbers shown in column 8.

No. 3.—RETURN of the Number of Public Houses, Beer Houses, Brothels, &c.—*continued.*

DISTRICTS.	Year.	PUBLIC HOUSES				BEER HOUSES					BROTHELS.					
		Where Common Women Resided, and were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Where Common Women did not Reside, but were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.	Where Common Women Resided, and were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Where Common Women did not Reside, but were provided with Accommodation for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.	Licensed to sell Beer not to be Drunk on the Premises.*	Public Houses.	Beer Houses.	Private Houses in which Women Resided and practised Prostitution.	Private Houses in which Accommodation was indiscriminately provided to all comers for the Purpose of Prostitution.	Other.	TOTAL.
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)	(13.)	(14.)	(15.)
SHORNCLIFFE	1868	8	-	86	94	8	-	26	34	-	8	8	4	-	-	20
	1869	5	-	91	96	1	-	22	23	-	5	1	7	-	-	13
	1870	4	-	94	98	-	-	25	25	-	4	-	2	-	-	6
	1871	3	-	99	102	-	-	25	25	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
	1872	3	-	92	95	-	-	21	21	-	3	-	1	-	-	4
	1873	2	-	94	96	-	-	20	20	1	2	-	-	-	-	2
	1874	2	-	98	100	-	-	21	21	1	2	-	-	-	-	2
COLCHESTER	1869	1	3	102	106	3	5	42	50	24	4	8	11	4	-	27
	1870	1	2	108	111	-	2	48	50	26	3	2	4	3	-	12
	1871	2	1	104	107	-	1	48	49	27	3	1	4	2	-	10
	1872	2	-	103	105	-	-	49	49	26	2	-	6	2	-	10
	1873	2	-	107	109	-	-	47	47	23	2	-	5	3	-	10
	1874	2	-	107	109	1	-	47	48	20	2	1	11	3	-	17
GREENWICH	1870	-	-	193	193	-	-	126	126	1	-	-	22	12	2	36
	1871	-	-	206	206	-	-	125	125	1	-	-	13	14	2	29
	1872	-	-	206	206	-	-	125	125	1	-	-	5	14	2	21
	1873	-	-	205	205	-	-	131	131	3	-	-	9	11	1	21
	1874	-	-	207	207	-	-	125	125	3	-	-	11	12	-	23
WINCHESTER	1870	3	-	96	99	1	-	61	62	-	3	1	1	5	-	10
	1871	3	-	94	97	-	-	62	62	-	3	-	1	5	-	9
	1872	2	-	95	97	-	-	62	62	-	2	-	2	6	-	10
	1873	-	-	98	98	-	-	57	57	2	-	-	1	7	-	8
	1874	-	-	98	98	-	-	37	37	3	-	-	7	1	-	8
DOVER	1870	10	-	191	201	1	1	31	33	-	10	2	45	9	-	66
	1871	13	-	187	200	-	1	32	33	-	13	1	35	4	-	53
	1872	9	-	191	200	1	-	25	26	-	9	1	27	4	-	41
	1873	5	-	193	198	-	-	27	27	-	5	-	26	2	-	33
	1874	3	-	196	199	-	-	24	24	-	3	-	22	2	-	27
CANTERBURY	1870	9	-	169	178	-	-	15	15	9	9	-	4	2	-	15
	1871	9	-	168	177	-	-	9	9	-	9	-	4	2	-	15
	1872	1	3	174	178	-	-	6	6	-	4	-	6	-	-	10
	1873	-	2	175	177	-	-	7	7	-	2	-	9	1	8	20
	1874	1	1	171	173	-	-	7	7	-	2	-	8	-	-	10
DEAL	1870	6	-	104	110	1	-	21	22	-	6	1	4	-	-	11
	1871	7	-	103	110	1	-	21	22	-	7	1	4	-	-	12
	1872	8	-	103	111	1	-	21	22	-	8	1	1	-	-	10
	1873	6	-	104	110	1	-	19	20	-	6	1	2	-	-	9
	1874	4	1	105	110	2	-	18	20	-	5	2	1	-	-	8
MAIDSTONE	1870	4	12	74	90	4	4	120	128	14	16	8	21	7	-	52
	1871	-	7	83	90	2	3	121	126	14	7	5	21	7	-	40
	1872	-	2	81	83	-	1	105	106	14	2	1	16	6	-	25
	1873	-	2	83	85	1	1	94	96	14	2	2	6	-	14	24
	1874	-	2	84	86	-	-	97	97	14	2	-	6	-	14	22
GRAVESEND	1870	2	-	113	115	1	-	74	75	-	2	1	5	4	-	12
	1871	3	-	112	115	1	-	74	75	-	3	1	6	5	-	15
	1872	1	1	115	117	1	1	68	70	-	2	2	7	7	-	18
	1873	1	1	115	117	-	-	62	62	-	2	-	9	-	11	22
	1874	1	3	113	117	1	-	61	62	4	4	1	5	1	-	11
SOUTHAMPTON	1870	3	5	173	181	7	1	263	271	10	8	8	74	24	2	116
	1871	2	3	176	181	2	1	263	266	7	5	3	64	31	-	103
	1872	-	3	192	195	2	4	254	260	10	3	6	55	22	-	86
	1873	-	-	199	199	-	2	254	256	11	-	2	34	29	-	65
	1874	-	-	199	199	-	1	259	260	9	-	1	40	12	-	53

* The numbers shown in this column are not included in the numbers shown in column 8.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN showing the Result of the FIRST MEDICAL EXAMINATION of COMMON WOMEN brought on the REGISTER for the First Time and Re-registered during the Year, in the several Districts, in Comparison with that of the FIRST MEDICAL EXAMINATION of COMMON WOMEN who remained on the REGISTER on 31st December of preceding Year.

Y E A R.	Women Newly Registered and Re-registered during the Year,						Women Remaining on the Register on 31st December of preceding Year,						Per-Centage of Disease computed on the Result of the First Medical Examination of	R E M A R K S.
	Who were found on their First Medical Examination to be			Number of Cases in which Women came up for Medical Examination, but were not Medically Examined at the time of their Attendance, and did not again Attend, they having left the District, &c.	Number of Cases in which Women did not come up for Medical Examination, they having left the District, &c.	Total Number of Women Registered for the First Time during the Year, including each Case in which Women were Re-registered.	Who were found on their First Medical Examination to be			Total Number of Women remaining on the Register on the 31st December of preceding Year.	Women newly Registered. (13.)	Women previously Registered. (14.)		
	Free from Disease.	Diseased.	TOTAL.				Free from Disease.	Diseased.	TOTAL.					
1865	-	123	692	815	1	7	823	-	-	-	-	8491	-	(a) The numbers for the Woolwich District are not included in these Totals, in consequence of the requisite information not being obtainable.
1866	-	101	573	674	3	8	(a) 685	380	198	528	682	8501	3750	
1867	-	224	686	910	-	2	(a) 912	478	217	695	1,015	7538	3122	
1868	-	491	1,549	2,040	-	3	(a) 2,043	763	315	1,078	1,442	7593	2922	
1869	-	888	858	1,746	3	-	1,749	1,827	519	2,346	2,427	4914	2212	
1870	-	1,882	1,016	2,898	13	17	2,928	1,961	372	2,333	2,461	3506	1595	
1871	-	1,499	757	2,256	27	24	2,307	2,162	232	2,394	2,650	8355	969	
1872	-	1,279	742	2,021	20	13	2,054	1,986	201	2,187	2,411	3671	919	
1873	-	1,147	701	1,848	40	16	1,904	1,913	172	2,085	2,290	3793	825	
1874	-	1,326	646	1,972	33	36	2,041	1,859	130	1,989	2,121	3270	654	

RETURN showing the Result of the FIRST MEDICAL EXAMINATION of COMMON WOMEN brought on the REGISTER for the First Time, and Re-registered during the Year, in the Portsmouth, Devonport, Sheerness, Chatham, Woolwich, Aldershot, Windsor, Shorncliffe, Colchester, Greenwich, Dover, Canterbury, Deal, Maidstone, Gravesend, and Southampton Districts, in Comparison with that of the FIRST MEDICAL EXAMINATION of COMMON WOMEN who remained on the REGISTER on 31st December of preceding Year.

DISTRICTS.	YEAR.	Women newly Registered and Re-registered during the Year,						Women remaining on the Register on 31st December of preceding Year,						Per-Centage of Disease computed on the Result of the First Medical Examination of	REMARKS.			
		Who were found on their First Medical Examination to be			(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	Who were found on their First Medical Examination to be			(9.)	(10.)				(11.)	(12.)
		Free from Disease.	Diseased.	TOTAL.					Free from Disease.	Diseased.	TOTAL.							
PORTSMOUTH	1865	37	294	331	331	—	88	274	—	—	—	—	87	361	88.82	32.12	—	
	1866	39	140	179	179	—	202	297	—	—	—	—	156	453	78.21	31.99	—	
	1867	79	157	236	286	—	207	310	—	—	—	—	196	506	66.53	33.23	—	
	1868	155	240	395	395	—	463	614	—	—	—	—	31	645	60.76	24.59	—	
	1869	338	156	494	494	—	521	681	—	—	—	—	41	722	31.58	23.49	—	
	1870	274	95	369	369	—	463	552	—	—	—	—	38	590	25.75	20.05	—	
	1871	335	84	419	419	—	461	548	—	—	—	—	38	586	20.05	15.88	—	
	1872	310	86	396	396	—	495	527	—	2	—	—	51	580	21.72	15.88	—	
	1873	301	94	395	402	7	492	518	—	—	—	—	40	558	23.80	6.07	—	
	1874	388	74	462	464	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16.02	5.02	—	
DEVONPORT.	1865	—	202	202	203	—	2	14	—	—	—	—	—	—	100.00	—	—	
	1866	10	320	330	333	1	12	14	—	—	—	—	48	62	98.97	85.71	—	
	1867	11	288	299	299	3	18	72	—	—	—	—	144	216	96.32	75.00	—	
	1868	100	1,013	1,113	1,113	—	101	229	—	—	—	—	161	390	91.02	55.90	—	
	1869	97	260	357	360	3	601	808	—	—	—	26	661	72.83	25.16	—		
	1870	170	141	311	313	2	488	609	—	—	—	52	657	45.34	19.87	—		
	1871	191	114	305	305	2	460	506	—	—	—	51	557	38.37	9.09	—		
	1872	169	129	298	304	6	441	475	—	—	—	28	432	43.29	7.16	—		
	1873	145	117	262	274	8	408	453	—	1	—	20	474	44.66	9.93	—		
	1874	139	113	252	256	2	399	432	—	1	—	14	447	44.84	7.64	—		
SHEERNESS	1865	17	49	66	73	—	8	36	—	—	—	—	19	55	74.24	77.78	—	
	1866	20	37	57	65	—	39	51	—	—	—	16	67	64.91	23.53	—		
	1867	28	15	43	45	—	41	53	—	—	—	1	54	34.88	22.64	—		
	1868	17	10	27	30	—	37	50	—	—	—	—	50	26.00	37.04	—		
	1869	22	17	39	39	—	47	54	—	—	—	—	54	26.00	43.59	—		
	1870	24	16	40	40	—	55	58	—	—	—	1	59	40.00	12.96	—		
	1871	27	7	34	34	—	46	47	—	—	—	7	54	20.59	5.17	—		
	1872	23	4	27	29	—	46	47	—	—	—	7	54	14.81	2.13	—		
	1873	26	7	33	36	—	37	39	—	—	—	3	42	21.21	5.13	—		
	1874	44	6	50	51	—	38	38	—	—	—	3	38	12.00	—	—		

WINDSOR	1868	58	33	91	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
---------	------	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

No. 4.—RETURN showing the Result of the First Medical Examination of Common Women in the undermentioned Districts—*continued.*

DISTRICTS.	YEAR.	Women newly Registered and Re-registered during the Year.										Women remaining on the Register on 31st December of preceding Year.				Per-Centage of Disease computed on the Result of the First Medical Examination of	REMARKS.		
		Who were found on their First Medical Examination to be			Number of Cases in which Women came up for Medical Examination, but were not Medically Examined, and at the time of their Attendance, they having left the District, &c.			Number of Cases in which Women did not come up for Medical Examination, they having left the District, &c.			Total Number of Women Registered for the First Time during the Year, including each Case in which Women were Re-registered.			Who were found on their First Medical Examination to be	Who came up for Medical Examination, but were not Medically Examined, and who did not again attend, they having left the District, &c.			Who did not come up for Medical Examination, they having left the District, &c.	Total Number of Women remaining on the Register on 31st December of preceding Year.
		(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.)	(9.)	(10.)	(11.)	(12.)						
MAIDSTONE -	1870	63	28	91	—	—	91	—	—	—	—	—	—	30.77	—				
	1871	19	14	33	—	—	33	38	1	39	—	1	40	42.42	2.56				
	1872	18	14	32	—	—	32	30	1	31	—	3	34	43.75	3.23				
	1873	17	26	43	2	—	45	18	9	27	—	3	30	60.47	33.33				
	1874	32	12	44	1	—	45	19	3	22	—	5	27	27.27	13.64				
GRAVESEND -	1870	95	26	121	—	8	129	—	—	—	—	—	—	21.49	—				
	1871	53	20	73	—	1	74	34	1	35	—	5	40	27.40	2.86				
	1872	40	22	62	—	—	62	36	—	36	—	2	38	35.48	—				
	1873	29	15	44	3	—	47	23	3	26	—	6	32	34.09	11.54				
	1874	33	16	49	3	1	53	25	1	26	1	3	30	32.65	3.85				
SOUTHAMPTON -	1870	143	76	219	—	—	219	—	—	—	—	—	—	34.70	—				
	1871	84	24	108	—	8	116	111	15	126	—	29	155	22.22	11.90				
	1872	93	19	112	—	3	115	138	6	144	—	16	160	16.96	4.17				
	1873	104	41	145	5	—	150	135	10	145	1	23	169	28.28	6.90				
	1874	83	26	109	2	—	111	149	5	154	—	9	163	23.85	3.25				

— No. 5. —

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN showing the AGES of GIRLS who had been found in Improper Places and Bad Company, but who, before it was certain they had commenced a Career of Vice, returned to Friends, on finding they were under the Observation of the Police employed under the above-mentioned Acts.

DISTRICT.	A G E S.							
	12	15	18	21	24	27	30	TOTAL.
	and under 15.	and under 18.	and under 21.	and under 24.	and under 27.	and under 30.	and over.	
PORTSMOUTH - -	—	5	3	1	1	—	—	10
DEVONPORT - -	27	49	25	14	8	11	8	142
SHEERNESS - - -	—	2	3	—	1	—	—	6
CHATHAM - - -	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	4
WOOLWICH - - -	—	2	4	1	—	—	—	7
ALDERSHOT - - -	1	8	7	6	4	2	4	32
WINDSOR - - -	—	2	2	2	—	1	—	7
SHORNCLIFFE - -	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	4
COLCHESTER - - -	2	5	3	—	—	—	—	10
GREENWICH - - -	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	3
WINCHESTER - - -	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	4
DOVER - - -	—	4	3	1	—	—	—	8
CANTERBURY - - -	—	3	2	1	1	—	—	7
DEAL - - -	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
MAIDSTONE - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
GRAVESEND - - -	1	—	2	—	—	1	—	4
SOUTHAMPTON - -	—	—	3	2	—	—	—	5
TOTAL - - -	31	88	64	29	15	15	12	254

— No. 6. —

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

RETURN showing the AGES of GIRLS who had commenced Immoral Practices, but who discontinued to do so on being cautioned by the Police employed under the above-mentioned Acts, and who consequently were not Registered.

DISTRICT.	A G E S.							
	12 and under	15 and under	18 and under	21 and under	24 and under	27 and under	30 and over.	TOTAL.
	15.	18.	21.	24.	27.	30.		
PORTSMOUTH - -	—	2	1	1	1	—	1	6
DEVONPORT - -	—	35	43	19	16	6	18	137
SHEERNESS - -	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
CHATHAM - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
WOOLWICH - - -	—	3	5	1	—	—	—	9
ALDERSHOT - -	—	—	3	—	1	1	5	10
WINDSOR - - -	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	3
SHORNCLIFFE - -	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
COLCHESTER - -	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	4
GREENWICH - -	—	—	1	2	—	—	1	4
WINCHESTER - -	—	3	2	1	—	—	—	6
DOVER - - -	—	—	1	2	1	—	3	7
CANTERBURY - -	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	2
DEAL - - -	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	3
MAIDSTONE - -	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
GRAVESEND - -	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	2
SOUTHAMPTON - -	—	—	4	2	1	1	—	8
TOTAL - - -	—	50	63	34	21	10	28	206

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

COPY of ANNUAL REPORT, for 1874, of *Captain Harris*, Assistant Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, on the Operation of the CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
12 March 1875.*

COURT OF CHANCERY.

ACCOUNT of the RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE of the PAYMASTER GENERAL on behalf of the COURT OF CHANCERY during the period from 1st September 1873 to 31st August 1874 (exclusive of Securities expressed in Foreign Currencies); together with the REPORT of the COMPTROLLER and AUDITOR GENERAL thereon.

(PRESENTED PURSUANT TO ACT 35 & 36 VICT. c. 44, s. 20.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
8 June 1875.

A GENERAL STATEMENT of the SECURITIES and MONEY appearing by the BOOKS at the CHANCERY PAY OFFICE to be in the COURT OF CHANCERY at the end of the Month of August 1874.

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
Cash (of which 883,886 <i>l.</i> 14 <i>s.</i> 4 <i>d.</i> was on deposit)	4,334,239	4	4	Birmingham Canal Navigation Consolidated Stock	900	-	-
Consolidated £. 3 per Cent. Annuities	45,544,346	3	6	Ely Valley Railway Consolidated Stock	575	-	-
Reduced £. 3 per Cent. Annuities	5,548,278	15	11	Chelsea Waterworks Stock	1,000	-	-
New £. 3 per Cent. Annuities	7,645,491	9	7	Great Northern Railway Company:			
Bank Stock	907,638	13	4	Consolidated B. Stock	30,500	-	-
India £. 4 per Cent. Stock	1,347,961	19	2	£. 5 per Cent. Perpetual Preference Stock	2,158	10	-
India £. 5 per Cent. Stock	600,583	10	10	£. 5 per Cent. Preference Redeemable Stock	175	-	-
New £. 3. 10 per Cent. Annuities	5,863	9	6	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Redeemable Preference Stock	150	-	-
New £. 2. 10. per Cent. Annuities	9,342	18	4	Consolidated Original Stock	1,620	-	-
Annuities ending July 1901	20	-	-	£. 4 per Cent. Debenture Stock	15,841	-	-
Annuities ending January 1880	128	-	-	South Eastern Railway Company:			
Annuities for 30 years from 1855	1,109	14	7	Consolidated Stock	1,100	-	-
Metropolitan Consolidated Stock (£. 3. 10. per Cent.)	105,143	6	2	Ordinary Stock	6,000	-	-
Exchequer Bills	229,100	-	-	£. 5 per Cent., &c., 1861 Stock	100	-	-
Consolidated £. 3 per Cent. Certificates	14,200	-	-	£. 5 per Cent., Preference, &c., 1863 Stock	320	-	-
London and St. Katharine Docks Stock	92,307	17	-	Guaranteed £. 4. 10. per Cent. Stock	1,300	-	-
East and West India Dock Stock	24,812	5	9	£. 5 per Cent. Perpetual Debenture Stock	3,960	-	-
Royal Exchange Assurance Stock	5,120	4	2	London and South Western Railway Company:			
Liverpool, London, and Globe Insurance Company Stock	140	-	-	Consolidated Stock	24,700	-	-
Globe £. 6 per Cent. Annuities	90	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preference Stock	400	-	-
East Indian Railway Company Stock	43,750	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Perpetual Mortgage, &c., Stock	2,225	-	-
East Indian Railway 4½ per Cent. Debenture Stock	4,350	-	-	London and North Western Railway Company:			
Bombay, Baroda, &c., Railway Stock	17,023	-	-	Consolidated Stock	16,819	10	-
Madras Railway Stock	13,890	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preference Stock, 1868	100	-	-
Great Indian Peninsular Railway Stock	151,320	-	-	Perpetual £. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock	300	-	-
Oude and Rohilkund Railway Stock	8,604	-	-	St. Helen's Stock, Class A.	1,000	-	-
Great Southern of India Railway:				£. 4 per Cent. Perpetual Debenture Stock	59,121	-	-
£. 5 per Cent. Stock	2,200	-	-	£. 4 per Cent. Perpetual Preference Shrewsbury and Welchpool Stock	1,000	-	-
£. 4½ per Cent. Debenture Stock	1,730	-	-	Chester and Holyhead £. 5 per Cent. Stock	2,500	-	-
Scinde, Punjab, and Delhi Railway Stock	11,993	-	-	Buckinghamshire Railway £. 4 per Cent. Stock, 1852	820	-	-
Delhi Stock of the Scinde Railway	6,595	-	-	London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company:			
Commercial Gas Company's Stock	156	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Arbitration Debenture Stock	3,126	-	-
Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Consolidated Stock	11,649	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Arbitration Preference Stock	1,262	-	-
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway:				Arbitration Ordinary Stock	420	-	-
Consolidated Stock	3,740	-	-	Manchester, Sheffield, &c., Railway, £. 4. 10. per Cent. Debenture Stock	1,509	10	-
Guaranteed £. 5 per cent. No. 1 Stock	1,720	-	-	Midland Railway Company:			
Guaranteed £. 5 per cent. No. 4 Stock	1,420	-	-	Consolidated Stock	3,493	-	-
Debenture Stock	2,250	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preference Stock	292	-	-
Preference £. 4. 10. per cent. &c. 1861, Stock	6,562	-	-	Bradford Preferential Stock	4,000	-	-
£. 7 per cent., &c., Stock	100	-	-	Leicester and Hitchin Stock	4,000	-	-
Consolidated £. 6 per Cent. Stock	220	-	-	£. 4 per Cent. Debenture Stock	2,292	10	-
Preferential £. 5 per Cent. Stock	3,000	-	-	Irredeemable £. 4. 10. per Cent. Preferential Stock	390	-	-
Preference £. 4. 10. per Cent. No. 3	750	-	-	Leicester and Swannington Railway Stock	700	-	-
London and Blackwall Railway Consolidated Stock	690	-	-	£. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock	172	-	-
East Lincolnshire Railway Consolidated £. 6 per Cent. Stock	1,250	-	-	Monmouthshire Railway and Canal Company			
Great Eastern Railway Company:				Ordinary Stock	1,000	-	-
Ordinary Stock	1,681	10	-	North Eastern Railway Company:			
£. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock	313	-	-	£. 4 per Cent. Preference Stock	600	-	-
£. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock, 1864	1,000	-	-	£. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock	4,800	-	-
£. 5 per Cent. Debenture Stock	3,520	-	-	£. 4 per Cent. Berwick Stock	4,000	-	-
£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preference Stock	200	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preferential Stock	4,000	-	-
Eastern Counties £. 5 per Cent. Extension No. 1 Stock	1,333	6	8	Irredeemable £. 4 per Cent. Debenture Stock	3,560	-	-
Guaranteed £. 5 per Cent. Extension No. 1 Eastern Counties Stock	300	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preferential 1865 Stock	1,000	-	-
£. 6 per Cent. Consolidated Guaranteed Stock	160	-	-	Consols	2,378	-	-
Consolidated Norfolk, &c., Stock	400	-	-	North British Railway Company:			
£. 5 per Cent. A. Debenture Stock 1867	4,052	-	-	Edinburgh and Glasgow Preference Stock	600	-	-
New £. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock	3,980	-	-	Consolidated Preference No. 1. Stock	574	15	-
Eastern Counties £. 5 per Cent. No. 2, &c.	149	-	-	£. 4. 5. per Cent. Debenture Stock	20,000	-	-
Great Western Railway Company:				Lowestoft Railway and Harbour Consolidated Stock	1,000	-	-
Consolidated Ordinary Stock	2,482	-	-	Royston and Hitchin Railway, &c., Consolidated Stock	700	-	-
Rent Charge Stock	1,280	-	-	Victoria Station, &c., Railway:			
Consolidated Guaranteed Stock	27,486	-	-	Consolidated Ordinary Stock	500	-	-
Consolidated Preference Stock	4,790	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Debenture Stock	500	-	-
£. 4 per Cent. Debenture Stock	720	-	-	£. 4. 10. per Cent. Preference Stock	1,425	-	-
£. 4. 10. per Cent. Debenture Stock	4,357	-	-	Imperial Gaslight, &c., Company Stock, 1871	550	-	-
Bristol and Exeter £. 5 per Cent. Preference Stock	150	-	-				
Caledonian Railway Company:							
Consolidated Stock	15,000	-	-				
Aberdeen £. 6 per Cent. Preference Stock	300	-	-				
Aberdeen £. 3. 10. per Cent. Preference No. 1 Stock	100	12	7				
£. 4 per Cent. Debenture Stock	43	-	-				

GENERAL STATEMENT of the Securities and Money in the Court of Chancery, at the end of the Month of August 1874—*contd.*

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
Gas Light and Coke Company's Stock:				St. George's Paving Board Bonds	2,400	-	-
£. 10 Shares, Class A.	1,250	-	-	Sardinian 5 per Cent. Bonds	400	-	-
Ditto - Class B.	370	-	-	Swedish 5 per Cent. 1868 Bonds	2,200	-	-
Ditto - Class C.	90	-	-	Southampton Waterworks Bonds	750	-	-
£. 5 per cent. Preference 1st Issue	300	-	-	United States of America:			
Ditto - ditto - 2nd Issue	270	-	-	New Orleans and Jackson, &c., 1st Mortgage Bonds	675	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 3rd Issue	370	-	-	Ditto - ditto 2nd Series Bonds	225	-	-
South Australian Adelaide Waterworks Bonds	100	-	-	Victoria 6 per Cent. 1865 Bonds	20,000	-	-
Ditto - Adelaide and Gawler Town Railway Bonds	1,400	-	-	Victoria Railway Loan Bonds	4,500	-	-
Australian Mortgage Bonds	800	-	-	Mortgage Deeds	4,732	11	8
Brazilian, 4½ per Cent. 1863 Bonds	3,000	-	-	Notes, Bills, and Private Bonds	27,188	2	10
Ditto - ditto - 1852 Bonds	1,000	-	-		£.	67,344,016	18 11
Ditto - ditto - 1858 Bonds	1,000	-	-				
Ditto 5 per Cent. 1865 Bonds	9,400	-	-				
Ditto 5 per Cent. 1871 Bonds	25,000	-	-				
Canada 6 per Cent. 1851 Bonds	2,000	-	-				
Ditto - ditto 1853 Bonds {1853}	300	-	-				
Ditto - ditto 1855 {1855}							
Ditto - ditto 1859 {1859}							
Ditto 5 per Cent. 1860 Bonds	23,800	-	-				
Chilian 6 per Cent. 1867 Bonds	30,400	-	-				
Ditto 5 per Cent. 1870 Bonds	4,000	-	-				
Crystal Palace District Gas Company's Bonds	500	-	-				
East India 4 per Cent Bonds	7,700	-	-				
East Indian Railway (Debenture Bonds)	1,500	-	-				
Lambeth Waterworks Bonds	2,000	-	-				
Mersey Dock and Harbour Bonds	2,000	-	-				
Metropolitan Waggon Company Mortgage Debentures	1,500	-	-				
New Brunswick Loan Bonds	2,000	-	-				
New Zealand Government 5 per Cent. Bonds	9,200	-	-				
Ditto - Province of Auckland Bonds	2,000	-	-				
New South Wales 5 per Cent. Bonds	17,700	-	-				
Natal 6 per Cent. Harbour Works Bonds	6,600	-	-				
Nova Scotia Loan Bonds	2,000	-	-				
Russian Government 4 per Cent. of Nicholas Railway Bonds	2,040	-	-				
Russian Anglo-Dutch 5 per Cent. Loan Bonds	690	-	-				
Russian 5 per Cent. 1872 Bonds	28,900	-	-				
Ditto - ditto 1822 Bonds	6,179	-	-				
Ditto - Provincial Orel Vitebsk Railway Bonds	100	-	-				
Russian Loan 1862 Bonds	100	-	-				
Spanish 3 per Cent. Consolidated Bonds	53,550	-	-				
Public Debt of Spain, Provisional Certificates	20	8	-				
St. Pancras Skinners' Estate Bonds	2,000	-	-				
Ditto Bedford Estate Bonds	1,600	-	-				

	£.	s.	d.
St. George's Paving Board Bonds	2,400	-	-
Sardinian 5 per Cent. Bonds	400	-	-
Swedish 5 per Cent. 1868 Bonds	2,200	-	-
Southampton Waterworks Bonds	750	-	-
United States of America:			
New Orleans and Jackson, &c., 1st Mortgage Bonds	675	-	-
Ditto - ditto 2nd Series Bonds	225	-	-
Victoria 6 per Cent. 1865 Bonds	20,000	-	-
Victoria Railway Loan Bonds	4,500	-	-
Mortgage Deeds	4,732	11	8
Notes, Bills, and Private Bonds	27,188	2	10
	£.	67,344,016	18 11

	Sicca Rs.	a.	p.
Stocks expressed in Indian Currency:			
East India 4 per Cent. Transfer Loan Stock	2,07,522	-	-
Registered Indian 4 per Cent., 1828-29	2,000	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1832-33	86,700	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1835-36	1,21,400	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1842-43	4,61,100	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1854-55	2,20,900	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1865	12,31,200	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1859-60	9,19,300	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1870	10,000	-	-
Ditto - ditto - 1872	4,94,300	-	-
	Rs.	38,04,422	- -

	Dollars.
Bonds in American Currency:	
Atlantic and Great Western Railway, Second Mortgage Bonds 8 per Cent.	122,000
Ditto - ditto - (A.) Scrip Certificate	876.04
Chicago and Burlington Railway, 8 per Cent.	97,000
Illinois Joliet and Northern Indiana Railway, 8 per Cent.	160,000
Michigan Central Railway, 8 per Cent.	58,000
	Dols.
	437,876.04

	£.	s.	d.
Securities of Value not expressed:			
Exchequer Orders, £. 5 per Annum	£. 5	per Annum.	
London Assurance Company	400	Shares.	

S. Parkinson.

I hereby certify that the accompanying list, subject to to the undermentioned corrections and with the exception of the cash balance, Funded Stocks, Annuities, and Bank Stock, for which separate Certificates are given, is a true statement of the Securities held by the Bank of England in the name of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Court of Chancery on the 31st August 1874.

Bank of England,
18 March 1875.

F. May, Chief Cashier.

The amount of Oude and Rohilkund Railway Stock should be 7,522 l. instead of 8,604 l.

The South Eastern Railway 5 per Cent. Stock, 1861, 100 l. was paid off in March 1874.

The following Certificates, &c., have never been deposited with the Bank of England, viz.:-

	£.	s.	d.
London and St. Katharine Dock Stock	92,307	17	-
East and West India Dock Stock	24,812	5	9
Royal Exchange Assurance Stock	5,120	4	2

London Assurance Company, 400 Shares.

The Bank held Memoranda, signed by Mr. Mortimer, in place of the undermentioned Certificates, which were not delivered until after the 31st August 1874, viz.:-

	£.	s.	d.
East Indian Railway	4,010	-	-
Great Indian Peninsula Railway	3,600	-	-

F. M.

I hereby certify that the amounts of Consolidated £. 3 per Cent Annuities, Reduced £. 3 per Cent. Annuities, New £. 3 per Cent. Annuities, Bank Stock, India £. 4 per Cent. Stock, India £. 5 per Cent. Stock, New 3 l. 10 s. per Cent. Annuities, New 2 l. 10 s. per Cent. Annuities, Annuities for terms of years ending July 1901, and January 1880, Annuities for 30 years, and Metropolitan Consolidated Stock, stated on the first page of the accompanying General Statement, have been compared with the Bank Books, and appear to be correct for the 31st August 1874.

Bank of England,
18 March 1875.

H. G. Aylmer, Deputy Accountant.

Balance standing to the credit of the account of the Paymaster General for the time being on behalf of the Court of Chancery on the evening of the 31st August 1874,

£. 670,026. 3 s.

Six hundred and seventy thousand and twenty-six pounds three shillings.

Bank of England,
15 March 1875.

Examined.

S. O. Gray,
Deputy Chief Cashier.

E. J. Curtis.

A STATEMENT of the BOXES, and other Miscellaneous EFFECTS, appearing by the Books at the Chancery Pay Office to be remaining in the BANK of ENGLAND, at the end of the Month of August 1874, to the Account of the PAYMASTER GENERAL for the time being, on behalf of the COURT OF CHANCERY.

- A box containing small articles of Jewellery.
- A box marked "Angas v. Angas, 1870, A. 98; Foreign Securities."
- A box marked "The Estate of William Banks; Wright v. Banks; Foreign Bonds and Securities."
- A box marked "Bevan v. Attorney General; Railway and other Stocks and Shares."
- A box marked "Re Bell, Bell v. Marshall, 1863, B. 314; Portuguese Bonds."
- A box marked "Browne v. Collins, 1870, B. 71; Securities."
- A box marked "Bowman v. Eilbeck, 1869, B. 102; Railway Securities."
- A box marked "Brown v. Gellatly, No. 1."
- A box marked "Brown v. Gellatly, No. 2."
- Three chests marked respectively "Brown v. Taylor, 1867, B. 377; Nos. 1, 2, and 3."
- A box marked "Cooke v. Aveline, 1868, C. 298."
- A box marked "Cassavetti v. Cassavetti, 1869, C. 113; Indian and Foreign Investments."
- A box marked "Coddington v. The Jacksonville, Pensacola and Mobile Railroad Company, 1873, C. 102; Securities."
- A paper marked "George Colman; Will."
- A box marked "Ashburner v. Nix, 1871, A. 41, No. 4; Jeeve's Mortgage."
- A box marked "Ashburner v. Nix, 1871, A. 41, No. 3; Garford's Mortgage."
- A box marked "Ashburner v. Nix, 1871, A. 41, No. 1; Tilgate Estate."
- A box marked "Ashburner v. Nix, 1871, A. 41, No. 6."
- A box marked "Ashburner v. Nix, 1871, A. 41, No. 5; Smith's Mortgage."
- A box marked "Clark v. Wood, 1873, C. 187; Certificate of Waterloo Bridge Shares."
- A box marked "In the matter of Mary Isabella Beecroft, widow, a person of unsound mind; South Devon Railway Co. Shares and other Securities."
- A box marked "Re Davies, Davies v. Atkinson; Railway Debenture Securities."
- A box marked "Wilkinson Dent v. Dent; Foreign Securities."
- A parcel marked "Davies v. Hallett; Shares in the Deposit and General Life Assurance Company."
- A box marked "Donaldson v. Donaldson; Indian Railway Stock."
- A box marked "Daniel Dixon, an Infant; Certificates of Railway Shares."
- A box marked "Evans v. Southall, 1872, E. 22; Shares of the London and North Western Railway Company."
- A box marked "Foster v. Knowles, 1871, F. 78; Documents of Title, Jewels, Trinkets, Watches, and Personal Ornaments."
- Five chests and one box marked "Sir Samuel Fludyer, a person of unsound mind; Plate and Jewellery."
- A box marked "Gray v. Bateman, 1872, G. 81; Foreign Securities."
- A box marked "Groom v. Groom, 1870, G. 36; Foreign Securities."
- A box marked "Greville v. Greville; Securities of P. E. J. Greville, and others in remainder."
- A box marked "Greville v. Greville; Securities of E. C. Baroness de Cetto, and others in remainder."
- Two boxes marked "L. S. A. Giffard, a person of unsound mind; Plate."
- A box marked "Estate of Richard Hay Glover and Glover v. Heeles; Silver Articles."
- A box marked "Christina Maria Grosett, widow, a person of unsound mind; Jewellery."
- A box marked "Herrick v. Franklin; Foreign Securities."
- A box marked "Hampton v. Holman, 1864, H. 42."
- A box marked "Hervey v. Hervey, 1868, H. 179; Diamond Ring."
- A box marked "Hervey v. Slack, 1868, H. 178; Diamond Necklace, Coronet, and Earrings."
- A box marked "Hervey v. Slack, 1868, H. 178; Portrait referred to in the Order dated 18th December 1868."
- A box marked "Jones v. Baker, 1870, J. 9; East India Bonds."
- A bag of Clipped Money, &c., in Jones v. Lloyd; 20 August 1776.
- A box marked "Fennings v. Pain, 1872, F. 38; Harwich Mortgages."
- A box marked "Fraser v. Petre, 1873, F. 114; Securities."
- A box marked "Kay v. Pierce, 1867, K. 5; Turkish Bonds."
- A box marked "Kingston Union v. Wood, 1873, K. 37."
- A box marked "Middleton v. Barber, 1869, M. 26; Railway Shares and Stock."
- A document marked "May v. Da Costa; Debenture, 1799."
- A box marked "Nixon v. Few; United States Bank Shares."
- A deed of settlement marked "Pritchard v. Fleetwood, and Duke of Hamilton v. Davenport."
- A box marked "Povah v. Walker, 1870, P. 148; Securities."
- A box marked "Re Maitland's Trust, 1872, M. 95; New South Wales Government 5 l. per Cent. Debentures, 1888 to 1901."
- A box marked "Re Edward Lacy's Estate; Stubbs v. Lacy, 1871, L. 21; Share of Testator's Daughter, Frances Stubbs, for life, and her Children named in Testator's Will, with remainders over as therein mentioned; Bonds and Securities."
- Two boxes marked respectively "Reeve v. Hancock, Nos. 1 and 2."
- A box marked "Matilda Sayer, a person of unsound mind; Plate and Jewellery."
- A box marked "Stephens v. Green; Securities for Legacies."
- A box marked "Anne Sheepshanks, a person of unsound mind; Silver and Plated Articles."
- A box marked "Stevens v. Wormall, 1869, S. 175; Railway Stock."
- A box marked "Trezvant v. Broughton."
- A box marked "Taylor v. Hall; Railway Stock."
- A box marked "Theakstone v. Theakstone, 1870, T. 147; Securities."
- A box marked "Mary Teresa Wakeman, a person of unsound mind; Plate, Jewellery, and Trinkets."
- A box marked "Rev. John Wynne, Clerk, a person of unsound mind; Railway Debentures."
- A box marked "Yglesias v. Yglesias, 1869, Y. 1; Trust Securities."
- Two Assignments of five tallies in White v. Killosby.
- A box marked "In the matter of Tobiah Teape, a person of unsound mind, 6 l. per Cent. Debenture Bonds of the Union Steamship Company (Limited)."
- A box marked "Smith v. Smith, 1874, S. 214; Foreign and Colonial Securities."

S. Parkinson.

I hereby certify that the boxes and miscellaneous effects mentioned in the annexed List were held by the Bank of England on account of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Court of Chancery, on the 31st August 1874.

Bank of England, 18 March 1875.

F. May, Chief Cashier.

NATIONAL DEBT COMMISSIONERS.—CHANCERY FUNDS.

ABSTRACT ACCOUNT of the COMMISSIONERS for the REDUCTION of the NATIONAL DEBT, showing the CASH RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS by them, and the Purchases, Transfers, and Sales of Stock, under the Provisions of the COURT of CHANCERY FUNDS ACT, 1872 (35 & 36 Vict. c. 44), as per Schedules annexed, in the Year ended 31st August 1873.

RECEIPTS.	Cash.	Stock (Purchases and Transfers).	PAYMENTS.	Cash.	Stock (Sales).
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Balances brought forward - - -	—	—	To Chancery Paymaster - - -	—	—
From Chancery Paymaster - - -	200,000 - -	—	For Stock purchased - - -	202,584 8 4	—
Proceeds of Stock sold - - -	—	—	Inland Revenue Department (In- come Tax) - - -	13 19 9	—
Dividends on Stock - - -	2,598 8 1	—	Stock Sold (as per contra) - - -	—	—
Stock purchased (as per contra) - - -	—	219,550 14 6		202,598 8 1	—
Stock transferred (the cash value of which (992,831 l. 9 s. 3 d.) is credited to the account of the Chancery Paymaster - }	- - -	1,071,646 5 10	Balances carried forward - - -	- - -	1,291,197 - 4
£.	202,598 8 1	1,291,197 - 4	£.	202,598 8 1	1,291,197 - 4

I do hereby certify that the foregoing Account is just and true, according to the best of my knowledge and belief.

C. Rivers Wilson,
Comptroller General.

NATIONAL DEBT COMMISSIONERS.—CHANCERY FUNDS.

ABSTRACT ACCOUNT of the COMMISSIONERS for the REDUCTION of the NATIONAL DEBT, showing the CASH RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS by them, and the Purchases, Transfers, and Sales of Stock, under the Provisions of the COURT of CHANCERY FUNDS ACT, 1872 (35 & 36 Vict. c. 44), as per Schedules annexed, in the Year ended 31st August 1874.

RECEIPTS.	Cash.	Stock (Purchases and Transfers).	PAYMENTS.	Cash.	Stock (Sales).
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Balances brought forward - - -	- - -	1,291,197 - 4	To Chancery Paymaster - - -	1,750,000 - -	—
From Chancery Paymaster - - -	—	—	For Stock purchased - - -	30,812 13 7	—
Proceeds of Stock sold - - -	1,750,000 - -	—	Inland Revenue Department (Income Tax) - - -	157 14 3	—
Dividends on Stock - - -	30,970 7 10	—	Stock Sold (as per contra) - - -	- - -	1,894,492 11 2
Stock purchased (as per contra) - - -	- - -	33,556 5 4		1,780,970 7 10	1,894,492 11 2
Stock transferred, the Cash value of which (1,782,714 l. 19 s. 4 d.) is credited to the account of the Chancery Paymaster - }	- - -	1,931,210 3 10	Balances carried forward - - -	- - -	1,361,470 18 4
£.	1,780,970 7 10	3,255,963 9 6	£.	1,780,970 7 10	3,255,963 9 6

I do hereby certify that the foregoing Account is just and true, according to the best of my knowledge and belief.

C. Rivers Wilson,
Comptroller General.

REPORT of the COMPTROLLER and AUDITOR GENERAL upon the ACCOUNTS of the Transactions of the PAYMASTER GENERAL on behalf of the COURT OF CHANCERY, and upon the BALANCE SHEET of RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE prepared by the Paymaster General, for the Year ending the 31st August 1874; also upon the ACCOUNTS of the COMMISSIONERS for the REDUCTION of the NATIONAL DEBT on behalf of the FUNDS of the COURT OF CHANCERY, during the Years ended 31st August 1873, and 31st August 1874, pursuant to the Act 35 & 36 Vict. c. 44, s. 20.

I. THESE Accounts and the accompanying statements have been examined under my superintendence, and I have to submit the following observations, which it appears to me desirable to make upon them, for the information of Parliament, as required by the Court of Chancery Funds Act. Accounts, &c. examined.

ACCOUNT of RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE of the PAYMASTER GENERAL.

II. In my report of 20th July 1874, upon the Account for the preceding period, it was suggested that the Cash and Securities coming into and going out of Court should be shown in separate columns, and that any Securities in foreign currency which might be received or delivered out, should also be exhibited in the Account. Suggestions adopted.

It will be seen that these suggestions have been adopted in the preparation of the present Account. There is, however, some incongruity in the introduction of the Securities in Foreign Currencies, in the same Column with the other Securities valued in Sterling Money; the more so as they are not shown in the totals. I would suggest that, in future Accounts, there should be a third Column for the Foreign Currency Securities, and that they should be totalled, as well as the Cash and the other Securities. I also think that a Note should be attached to the Account, stating that, in addition to the Balance of Cash and Securities shown therein, there are certain "Securities of Value not expressed," which will be found at the foot of the "General Statement of Securities," &c.

III. The amount of cash stated in the Account to have been brought into Court during the year, is 11,997,677 l. 10 s. 5 d. Amount of cash detailed.

This total is composed as follows:—

	£.	s.	d.
1. Dividends on Securities in Court - - - - -	2,029,446	1	4
2. Interest on money on Deposit - - - - -	13,153	4	11
3. Cash value of securities converted under Section 16 of the Act - - - - -	1,782,714	19	4
4. Cash paid into Court, including money received for Securities sold - - - - -	8,172,363	4	10
TOTAL - - - - £.	11,997,677	10	5

IV. The amount of cash paid out of Court during the year was 11,611,822 l. 10 s. 2 d. This total includes, of course, the payment of dividends and the money invested in securities, and it also includes a sum of 20,526 l. 9 s. 10 d. transferred to the Paymaster General's Cash Account at the Bank of England (other than Chancery) for payment into the Exchequer, consisting of,— Amount paid out of Court.

	£.	s.	d.
Fees of Taxation - - - - -	13,698	9	10
Lunacy per-centage Fees - - - - -	6,828	-	-
£.	20,526	9	10

V. In my Report of last year, I expressed an opinion that these fees should be separately stated in the Account. To that opinion I adhere, and it appears to me that the Account should also contain the particulars enumerated above, with the addition of a separation between cash received or paid out on account of suitors, and money received or paid for the sale or purchase of securities. Fees should be separately stated.

VI. There were, in the course of the year, 20 cases of amounts overdrawn, three of which were on interest drafts; but in all these cases the sums have been adjusted, although not all within the period of the Account.

VII. It will be seen that the Account shows a balance —

	£.	s.	d.	Balance.
of "Cash," amounting to - - - - -	4,334,239	4	4	
and of "Securities" (exclusive of those in foreign currencies), amounting to - - - - -	63,009,777	14	7	

VIII. As shown in my Report of last year, the first of these Balances includes a very great deal more than the actual cash at the Bank of England, which amounted, on 31st August 1874, to 670,026 l. 3 s. only, or, according to the books of the Chancery Paymaster and of this Office, to 669,926 l. 3 s., the money received for a South Eastern Railway Bond paid off in March 1874 not having been brought to account (owing to some difficulty beyond the Paymaster's control) until March 1875. Detail of Cash Balance.

The balance of "Cash" should be thus stated:—

	£.	s.	d.
Book debt due from Consolidated Fund, being the amount remaining due out of 2,764,744 l. 1 s. 10 d., shown in the First Schedule to the Act 32 & 33 Vict. c. 91 - - -	2,423,340	15	6
Cash Balance at Bank of England (exclusive of the 100 l. above mentioned) - - - - -	669,926	3	-
Cash liability of National Debt Commissioners for Stock and Cash, pursuant to Rules 28, 52 and 49, 51 (including 15,425 l. 17 s. 3 d. for interest on Deposits) - - -	1,240,972	5	10
TOTAL - - - £.	4,334,239	4	4

GENERAL STATEMENT OF SECURITIES, &c.

Observations.

IX. This Statement was forwarded by me to the Bank of England for verification, and the certificates of the Bank are appended to it.

As regards the "Corrections" specified in the Certificate of the Chief Cashier, I have to state as follows:—

"Oude and Rohilkund Railway Stock should be 7,522 l. instead of 8,604 l."

Copies of a Letter to the Chancery Paymaster upon this subject, and of his reply, are appended to this Report; the transfer alluded to therein was completed on 25th March last.

"The South Eastern Railway 5 per Cent. Stock, 1861. £.100 was paid off in March 1874."

This discrepancy has been already explained in my remarks on the Cash Balance.

"The following certificates have never been deposited with the Bank of England; viz.,—

	£.	s.	d.
"London and St. Katharine Dock Stock - - - - -	92,307	17	-
"East and West India Docks Stock - - - - -	24,812	5	9
"Royal Exchange Assurance Stock - - - - -	5,120	4	2
"London Assurance Company - - - - -	400	Shares.	

Upon reference to the books of this Department, in which the dividends paid upon these securities are recorded, it appears that they were all in Court on 31st August last.

"The Bank held Memoranda signed by Mr. Mortimer, in place of the under-mentioned certificates, which were not delivered until after the 31st August 1874; viz.,—

	£.
"East Indian Railway - - - - -	4,010
"Great Indian Peninsula Railway - - - - -	3,600."

This observation needs no comment.

STATEMENT OF BOXES, &c.

Statement certified.

X. The Certificate of the Bank of England is appended to the Statement, showing that the Boxes and Miscellaneous Effects mentioned were in the custody of the Bank on 31st August 1874.

STATISTICS.

Causes and Matters.

XI. The number of Causes and Matters on 31st August 1874 was 31,827, being a net increase of 681 in the 12 months from 1st September 1873.

Drafts.

XII. The number of drafts paid in the 12 months was 45,625, against 43,477 paid in the 11 months ending 31st August 1873.

Deposit Account.

XIII. The number of transactions occasioned by the establishment of the Deposit Account was 16,365, as against 10,662 in the eight months previously, and the amount of Cash on Deposit was 883,886 l. 14 s. 4 d.

Securities, &c.

XIV. The number of different descriptions of securities was, on the 31st August, 189, and the number of "Effects lettered" in Court was 76.

ACCOUNTS OF THE NATIONAL DEBT COMMISSIONERS.

National Debt Account.

XV. In my Report of last year, I expressed an opinion that, with reference to Section 20 of the Act, an Account should be rendered to my Department by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, comprising the whole of their transactions in relation to the Court of Chancery; and by a letter dated 31st August 1874, I was informed that the Lords of the Treasury had requested the National Debt Commissioners to render such an Account. The two Accounts upon which it now becomes my duty to report are the result of that request.

XVI. It

XVI. It will be seen that while these Accounts exhibit the amount of Stock transferred to the Commissioners under Section 16 of the Act, and its Cash value at the time of transfer (which, although not forming part of the Cash Balance of the Paymaster General at the bank, is carried to the credit of the several Causes or Matters concerned, and is therefore included in the Paymaster's amount of "Cash brought into Court"); they also show the amount of Cash either handed over by the Paymaster to the National Debt Commissioners, or by the Commissioners to the Paymaster, under Section 14 of the Act, which Cash is not included in the Total amounts brought into or paid out of Court in the Account of the Paymaster General, for the reason that these transactions are simply transfers from one part of the Balance to another.

XVII. During the first period the Paymaster General was in a position to hand over to the Commissioners a sum of 200,000 *l.*, but during the year ending 31st August 1874, he was obliged to make requisitions upon them at various times for sums to meet his current demands, amounting altogether to 1,750,000 *l.* Thus, while the value of Stock transferred to the Commissioners up to 31st August last was 2,775,546 *l.* 8 *s.* 7 *d.*, the Balance of Stock in their hands (being reduced by the amount necessarily sold to supply the Paymaster's Cash Balance) amounted at that date to 1,361,470 *l.* 18 *s.* 4 *d.* only, which, at the price of the day, viz., 92½, was equal to a sum of 1,262,764 *l.* in cash.

	£.	s.	d.
1st Account	-	992,831	9 3
2nd "	-	1,782,714	19 4
	£.	2,775,546	8 7

XVIII. The Cash liability of the Commissioners included in the balance of the Chancery Paymaster was, as shown above, 1,240,972 *l.* 5 *s.* 10 *d.*; but this amount includes a sum of 15,425 *l.* 17 *s.* 3 *d.* for interest accrued on money on deposit, which does not appear in the Accounts of the National Debt Commissioners.

It was provided by Rule 51, of 1872 (and the provision has been continued in the Rules of 1874), that the Commissioners should, every half year, "credit the account to be kept by them of moneys placed in their hands by the Paymaster General, with such sum as he should certify to be the amount of the interest which had accrued during the six calendar months preceding, on Money on Deposit."

It is to be observed, however, that this interest, although not specifically shown in the Commissioners' Accounts, is, in a manner, represented by the dividends on the Stock transferred to them, which dividends amounted, up to 31st August last, to a sum far exceeding the amount of the interest on moneys on deposit, viz., 33,568 *l.* 15 *s.* 11 *d.*; and the difference between the balance shown in the Account of the Commissioners, and their Cash liability (included in the balance of the Account of the Paymaster General), would, at the above valuation of the Stock, have amounted to 21,792 *l.*, thus—

	£.
Cash value of Stock on 31st August 1874	- - - 1,262,764
Cash liability per Paymaster's Account	- - - 1,240,972
Difference in favour of the Commissioners	- £. 21,792

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

XIX. In my Report of last year, I submitted certain correspondence upon the subject of "Dormant Accounts," and of the "Number of Words in Titles of Accounts."

In the new Rules which have been issued since the date of my Report, alterations have been made which make it unnecessary for me to refer to those subjects on the present occasion.

XX. I have only further to state, with reference to the observations contained in my former Report, and to the correspondence annexed to it relative to the nature of the audit, and the arrangements which would be necessary in order to make it, in the terms of the Treasury Letter of the 16th December 1871, "a complete check on Chancery Expenditure," that the Lords of the Treasury have now supplied me with a staff at present adequate for the performance of this branch of my business, and that since the 11th of January last, when the Chancery Funds Rules of 1874 came into operation, the extended Audit contemplated in the correspondence laid before Parliament has been applied to this Account.

Wm. Dunbar,
Comptroller General of Her Majesty's Exchequer,
and Auditor General of Public Accounts.

Exchequer and Audit Department,
18 May 1875.

CORRESPONDENCE referred to in the foregoing REPORT.

(No. 493.)

Sir,

Exchequer and Audit Department, 25 March 1875.

I AM directed by the Comptroller and Auditor General to inform you that, upon forwarding to the Bank of England for verification the general statement of securities and money in the Court of Chancery on 31st August 1874, which was received with your letter of the 8th ultimo, it appears by a certificate of the Chief Cashier that the amount of Oude and Rohilkund Railway Stock is, according to the Bank Books, 7,522 £. only, instead of 8,604 £.

It further appears by the books of this Office that the difference is thus made up, viz. :—

	£.
Brought into Court on 14th March 1874	886
Ditto - - - 18th July "	196
Difference	1,082
	7,522
	£. 8,604.

I am accordingly to request that you will be so good as to supply any information which it may be in your power to give with reference to this discrepancy.

S. Parkinson, Esq.,
&c. &c. &c.

I am, &c.
(signed) H. Treherne.

(No. 572.)

Sir,

Chancery Pay Office, Chancery Lane,
30 March 1875.

IN answer to a letter from your Department, dated 25th instant, No. 493, I have to state that a transfer of 1,082 £. Stock of the Oude and Rohilkund Railway Company from the Account of the Paymaster General on behalf of the Court of Chancery was in progress in the latter part of August last. The Stock Certificates, which were necessary to enable the transfer of the 1,082 £., to be registered in the Company's books, were withdrawn from the Bank of England on the 27th August, but the transfer was not completed until after the end of that month. As the usual evidence of the completion of the transfer did not after a considerable interval reach this office, I applied to the Secretary of the Company upon the subject. The Certificate required, showing that the transfer took place on the 7th September, has recently been obtained and transmitted to the Chancery Audit Office.

The Comptroller and Auditor General.

I am, &c.
(signed) S. Parkinson.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

ACCOUNT of the RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE
of the PAYMASTER GENERAL on behalf of the
COURT OF CHANCERY during the Period from
1st September 1873 to 31st August 1874 (exclusive
of Securities expressed in Foreign Currencies);
together with the Report of the
Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

(Presented pursuant to Act 35 & 36 Vict. c. 44, s. 20.)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
8 June 1875.*

577
COURTS OF JUSTICE (SALARIES AND FUNDS).

COURTS OF CHANCERY AND BANKRUPTCY.

ACCOUNTS prepared in pursuance of "THE COURTS OF JUSTICE (SALARIES AND FUNDS) ACT, 1869," showing in the manner therein directed the RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE of the COURT OF CHANCERY and of the COURT OF BANKRUPTCY, and the Deficit or Surplus of Receipts as compared with Expenditure, for the Year ended 31st March 1875.

Treasury Chambers, }
15 July 1875. }

W. H. SMITH.

(Presented in pursuance of the Act 32 & 33 Vict. c. 91, ss. 24, 26, 27, and 28.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
20 July 1875.

COURT OF CHANCERY. - - - - -

ACCOUNT prepared in pursuance of "THE COURTS OF JUSTICE (SALARIES AND FUNDS) ACT, 1869,"
EXPENDITURE of the COURT of CHANCERY, and the Deficit or Surplus of Receipts, as compared with
Year ended 31st March 1874.

PARTICULARS OF RECEIPTS, &c.	Amounts.		1874-75.	
	Year ended 31 March 1875.	Year ended 31 March 1874.	Increase.	Decrease.
Amount of the Dividends or Interest which would have arisen from the Stock transferred to the National Debt Commissioners, under the provisions of the above-named Act, and from the Stock purchased with Cash so transferred, if such Stock had not been cancelled, viz.:—	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
On Consols - - - - - 2,114,838 9 3 - 5 Jan. 1875	63,445 3 -			
On Reduced 3l. per Cents. - - - 1,823,483 3 10 - 10 Oct. 1874	54,704 9 10			
On New 3l. per Cents. - - - 24 6 - - 10 Oct. 1874	- 14 6			
On East India Stock - - - - - 4 11 - - -	-			
TOTAL Stock } cancelled - } - - - £. 3,938,346 4 -	118,150 7 4			
<i>Deduct—</i> Nominal amount of Stock in Consols represented by the Payments from the Exchequer, in aid of the Cash Balance of the Accountant General of the Court of Chancery - - - £. 373,371 15 6				
Amount of 3l. per cent. Annuities, equivalent to 231 l. 17 s. 2 d. carried under Order of Court of 10th July 1870, to Account of an Infant Legatee, &c. - - - 258 13 11				
373,630 9 5 { Year's interest thereon }	11,208 18 3			
£. 3,564,715 14 7	106,941 9 1			
Less: Income Tax, at 2 d. - - -	891 3 6			
	106,050 5 7	105,804 13 10	445 11 9	-
Amount paid to the Exchequer, in respect of the following:—				
Brokerage - - - - -	10,884 12 10			
Taxation Account Fees - - -	15,451 5 4			
Lunacy per-centage Account Fees - - -	9,998 - -			
Per-centage under Winding-up Acts - - -	192 11 1			
Fees received by Tipstaff, &c. - - -	24 19 8			
Extra Receipts by Official Solicitor - - -	1 18 -			
	36,553 6 11	31,573 7 9	4,979 19 2	-
Net amount received by the Inland Revenue Department for Stamps in lieu of Fees - - -	99,409 14 2	97,082 15 6	2,326 18 8	-
TOTAL Receipts - - - £.	242,013 6 8	234,260 17 1	7,752 9 7	-
Deficiency - - -	50,143 15 2	55,101 10 8	-	4,957 15 6
£.	292,157 1 10	289,362 7 9	7,752 9 7	4,957 15 6
Net Decrease of Deficiency - - - - -	£. 4,957. 15. 6.			

COURT OF CHANCERY.

32 & 33 Vict. c. 91, ss. 24, 26, 27, and 28, showing, in the manner therein directed, the RECEIPTS and Expenditure, in the Year ended 31st March 1875; showing also the Receipts and Expenditure in the preceding

PARTICULARS OF EXPENDITURE.	Amounts.		1874-75.	
	Year ended 31 March 1875.	Year ended 31 March 1874.	Increase.	Decrease.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Total Payments on account of Salaries, Retiring Annuities, and Compensations charged on the Consolidated Fund, viz. :—				
Salaries of Judges (including Salary of Lord Chancellor, 6,000 £. per annum) - - - - -	39,000 - -	38,741 7 6	258 12 6	—
Retiring Annuities of Judges (including Pensions of four late Lord Chancellors, at 5,000 £. per annum each) - - - - -	30,609 18 3	30,724 4 5	- -	114 6 2
Compensations, less amount of certain abolished Offices - - -	1,354 11 -	1,354 11 2	- -	- - 2
Total Payments for Salaries of Officers and Expenses provided for in the Civil Service Estimates, Class III., less the Amount of certain Items not forming part of the cost of the Chancery Court proper :				
Salaries - - - - -	152,898 17 -	150,410 3 10	2,488 13 2	—
Scrivenery and Printing - - - - -	15,278 15 10	14,433 17 10	844 18 -	—
Other Expenses - - - - -	4,024 19 7	4,639 19 4	- -	614 19 9
Total Payments for Compensations, Pensions, Retiring Annuities, and Superannuation Allowances of Officers, provided for in the Civil Service Estimates, Class VI., less Amount of certain abolished Offices - - - - -	39,903 16 6	39,448 16 9	454 19 9	—
Amount expended by the Office of Works for Rent, Rates, Taxes, Repair of Buildings, Furniture, Supply of Water, Gas, Fuel, &c. - - - - -	6,651 3 8	7,325 6 11	- -	674 3 3
Cost of Stationery supplied by the Stationery Office - - - - -	2,435 - -	2,284 - -	151 - -	—
TOTAL EXPENDITURE - - - £.	292,157 1 10	289,362 7 9	4,198 3 5	1,403 9 4

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

ACCOUNT prepared in pursuance of "THE COURTS OF JUSTICE (SALARIES AND FUNDS) ACT, 1869,"
EXPENDITURE of the COURT OF BANKRUPTCY, and the Deficit or Surplus of Receipts, as compared with
Year ended 31st March 1874.

PARTICULARS OF RECEIPTS, &c.	Amounts.		1874-75.	
	Year ended 31 March 1875.	Year ended 31 March 1874.	Increase.	Decrease.
Amount of the Dividends or Interest which would have arisen from the Stock transferred to the National Debt Commissioners, under the provisions of the above-named Act, and from the Stock purchased with Cash so transferred, if such Stock had not been cancelled, viz. :—	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
On Consols - - - - - £. s. d. For Year to				
On Consols - - - - - 684,900 16 11 - 5 Jan. 1875	20,547 - 6			
On Reduced 3 L. per Cents. - 1,188,740 11 7 - 10 Oct. 1874	35,662 4 4			
On New 3 L. per Cents. - 68,493 5 7 - 10 Oct. 1874	2,054 15 11			
Ditto - - - - - 1,303 11 8 - { Half-year to 5 April 1875 }	19 11 -			
TOTAL Stock cancelled - } - £. 1,943,438 5 9	58,283 11 9			
Deduct—				
Nominal amount of Stock in Consols represented by the Payments from the Exchequer, in aid of the Cash Balance of the Accountant in Bankruptcy, viz. :—				
On £. 379,579 13 3 - - - - - { Year to 5 Jan. 1875 }	11,387 7 9			
On £. 27,027 - 6 - - - - - { Half-year to 5 Jan. 1875 }	405 8 1			
406,606 13 9				
£. 1,536,831 12 -	11,792 15 10			
£. 46,490 15 11				
Less : Income Tax, at 2 d. - - -	390 19 3			
	46,099 16 8	46,290 13 10	- -	190 17 2
Amount paid to the Exchequer in respect of Fees received - - - - -	8,169 - 5	8,655 2 4	- -	486 1 11
Net Amount received by the Inland Revenue Department for Stamps in lieu of Fees, including the Stamps issued in respect of Bankruptcy business by Registrars of County Courts - - - - -	59,004 2 4	55,247 18 10	3,756 3 6	
TOTAL Receipts - - - £.	113,272 19 5	110,193 15 -	3,756 3 6	676 19 1
Deficiency - - -	21,735 15 6	20,733 12 6	1,002 3 -	-
£. 135,008 14 11	130,927 7 6	4,758 6 6	676 19 1	
Net Increase of Deficiency - - - - - £. 1,002. 3. -				

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

32 & 33 Vict. c. 91, ss. 24, 26, 27, and 28, showing, in the manner therein directed, the RECEIPTS and Expenditure, in the Year ended 31st March 1875; showing also the Receipts and Expenditure in the preceding

PARTICULARS OF EXPENDITURE.	Amounts.		1874-75.	
	Year ended 31 March 1875.	Year ended 31 March 1874.	Increase.	Decrease.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Total Payments on Account of Salaries charged on the Consolidated Fund - (The Chief Judge of the Court of Bankruptcy is paid as a Vice Chancellor of the Court of Chancery.)	Nil	Nil.	—	—
Total Payments for Salaries of Officers and Expenses of the London Bankruptcy Court, provided for in the Civil Service Estimates, Class III., viz. :—				
Salaries - - - - -	35,000 15 2	34,343 11 3	657 3 11	—
Expenses - - - - -	11,645 17 11	5,314 5 4	6,331 12 7	—
Remuneration paid (out of the Vote for County Courts) to County Court Registrars in respect of Bankruptcy business, under the Act 32 & 33 Vict. c. 71, ss. 68 and 79 - - - - -	30,235 19 -	28,672 - 8	1,563 18 4	—
Total Payments for Compensations, Pensions, Retiring Annuities, and Super- annuation Allowances of Officers (provided for in the Civil Service Estimates, Class VI.) - - - - -	53,306 11 -	60,887 4 -	- -	7,580 13 -
Amount expended by the Office of Works, for Rent, Rates, Taxes, Repair of Buildings, Furniture, Supply of Water, Gas, Fuel, &c. - - - - -	4,221 11 10	1,290 6 3	2,931 5 7	—
Cost of Stationery supplied by the Stationery Office - - - - -	598 - -	420 - -	178 - -	—
TOTAL EXPENDITURE - - - £.	135,008 14 11	130,927 7 6	11,662 - 5	7,580 13 -

COURTS OF JUSTICE
(SALARIES AND FUNDS).

COURTS OF CHANCERY AND BANKRUPTCY.

ACCOUNTS prepared in pursuance of "THE COURTS OF JUSTICE (SALARIES AND FUNDS) ACT, 1869," showing in the manner therein directed the RECEIPTS and EXPENDITURE of the COURT OF CHANCERY and of the COURT OF BANKRUPTCY, and the Deficit or Surplus of Receipts as compared with Expenditure, for the Year ended 31 March 1875.

(Presented in pursuance of the Act 32 & 33 Vict. c. 91,
ss. 24, 26, 27, and 28.)

Ordered by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
20 July 1875.

COURTS OF LAW (PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS).

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 24 June 1875;—for,

COPY "of the MINUTE of the Board of Treasury issued in 1873, directing a CIRCULAR to be sent to the JUDGES and other Heads of the ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS of the COURTS of LAW, to press upon them the Expediency of suspending any PERMANENT APPOINTMENT to VACANCIES in their Gift until such Time as the ROYAL COMMISSION on the LEGAL DEPARTMENTS should have reported, and Parliament should have decided, in regard to any Recommendations which it might make."

Treasury Chambers, }
28 June 1875. }

W. H. SMITH.

COPY of TREASURY MINUTE.

Treasury Chambers, 11th December 1873.

WRITE in the following terms to the several Judges and others mentioned in the Schedule attached hereto, respectively:—

My Lord (or Sir),

I am directed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to acquaint you that the Select Committee on Civil Services Expenditure, which was appointed by the House of Commons in the last Session, recommended in their second Report, dated 12th June 1873, that a small Commission should be appointed by the Crown to inquire into the administrative departments of the Courts of Justice, whose inquiries should embrace the numbers, salaries, and superannuations, and the manner of appointment and promotion for each establishment.

It was also suggested that the Commission should recommend who should be responsible to Parliament for the organisation of establishments, and what should be their relation to the Treasury.

The Select Committee further recommended that a short Bill should be introduced by Her Majesty's Government, providing that pending such legislation as might follow the inquiries of the Commission, no vacancy in a salaried office in any of these establishments should be permanently filled, without the previous consent in writing of the First Lord of the Treasury for the time being, and that every person so appointed should take his office subject to such alteration as to its duties, salary, and pension, whether on superannuation or abolition, as might be determined by Parliament after the Report of the Commission.

Their Lordships desire me to inform you, that in consequence of the recommendation of the Select Committee, a Commission has been appointed by Her Majesty under the Royal Sign Manual, which is now engaged in prosecuting its inquiries into the administrative department of the Courts in England, and which will, in due time, extend its inquiries into the departments attached to the Courts in Ireland and Scotland.

Her Majesty's Government did not apply to Parliament during last Session to prevent any fresh appointment being made in the manner recommended by the Select Committee, as such a measure would have raised various points requiring careful consideration; but placing confidence in those who have to appoint to the various offices in question, they have thought it better to request that in the event of

a vacancy in any legal office of the character referred to, the right of appointment to which is vested in yourself by statute or custom, a fresh appointment to such office may be suspended, and temporary provision may be made for the discharge of its duties, if such a course can be adopted without serious inconvenience to the public service.

If, however, it is indispensable that a fresh appointment should be made, it should, if possible, be conferred in such terms as will leave it subject to the pleasure of Parliament.

My Lords would submit these considerations to your serious attention, and they trust that, if occasion should arise, you will be disposed to act in the manner above suggested.

I am, &c.

Let copies of this letter be sent to the Queen's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Scotland, the Treasury Remembrancer in Ireland, and request that they will report to this Board any vacancy in an office of the character referred to, as soon as it comes to their knowledge.

SCHEDULE of JUDGES, &c., to whom Letters are to be written.

The Justices and Judges of the Central Criminal Court.	The Receiver Master of the Court of Chancery, Ireland.
The Lord Chancellor.	The Chief Secretary for Ireland (as regards appointments vested in Lord Lieutenant).
The Master of the Rolls.	The Lord Chief Justice of Queen's Bench.
Vice Chancellor Sir B. Malins.	The Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas.
Vice Chancellor Sir J. Bacon.	The Chief Baron of Exchequer.
Vice Chancellor Hall.	The several Puisne Judges in Ireland respectively.
The Lord Chief Justice, Court of Queen's Bench.	The Judges of the Court of Bankruptcy.
The Lord Chief Baron of Exchequer.	The Judge of the Landed Estates Court.
The Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas.	The Judge of the Probate Court.
The Chief Judge in Bankruptcy.	The Judge of the Admiralty Court.
The Judge of the Probate Court.	Mr. Justice Grove.
The Judge of the Admiralty Court.	Mr. Baron Martin.
Secretary of State, Home Department (as regards officers in Courts of Session, &c., Scotland).	Mr. Baron Bramwell.
The Lord Chancellor of Ireland.	Mr. Justice Brett.
The Master of the Rolls, Ireland.	Mr. Justice Denman.
The Vice Chancellor, Ireland.	Mr. Baron Pollock.

Who were the senior Judges on the last Summer Circuit.

COURTS OF LAW (PERMANENT
APPOINTMENTS).

COPY of the MINUTE of the Board of Treasury issued in 1873, directing a Circular to be sent to the Judges and other Heads of the ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS of the Courts of Law, to press upon them the Expediency of suspending any PERMANENT APPOINTMENT to VACANCIES in their Gift until such Time as the ROYAL COMMISSION on the LEGAL DEPARTMENTS should have reported, and Parliament should have decided, in regard to any Recommendations which it might make.

(*Lord Frederick Cavendish.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
29 June 1875.*

CRIMINAL LAW ACCOUNTS.

RETURN to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 19 March 1875;—for,

COPY “of TREASURY MINUTE, dated 29th January 1875, on the subject of the Examination, prior to Repayment, of the ACCOUNTS of COSTS incurred by COUNTIES and BOROUGHs in *England* in PROSECUTIONS at ASSIZES and SESSIONS, and under the SUMMARY JURISDICTION ACT.”

Treasury Chambers, }
19 March 1875. }

W. H. SMITH.

TREASURY MINUTE, dated 29th January 1875.

(No. 1628—75.)

THE Chancellor of the Exchequer states to the Board that Her Majesty's Government have had under consideration the arrangements adopted under the authority of a Treasury Minute of 25th July 1857, for the examination of costs of prosecutions at assizes and sessions, and under the summary statutes, prior to their repayment to the counties and boroughs in England. No. 12,206—57.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer observes that the arrangements in question formed the subject of a discussion in the House of Commons on the 15th March 1872, and that the late Government then undertook fully to consider the whole question, and to remedy as far as possible the objections to which this system of examination had given rise.

It appears to have been then contemplated that the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, at that time before the House of Commons, and into which the late Government proposed to introduce clauses with a view to relieve the jurisdictions of these costs, and to provide for their payment directly by Government officers out of public funds, would have removed the objections to which the re-examination of the costs in question, after their payment by the jurisdictions, had given rise.

This Bill, however, did not become law, and although measures have since been adopted by the Treasury with a view to afford to the jurisdictions fuller facilities for explaining doubtful or disputed items than the course of examination had theretofore permitted, with the result, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer believes, of preventing much loss to local funds, it is nevertheless the fact that the objections above referred to have not been removed; and Sir Stafford Northcote states that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, some alteration of the existing practice is called for.

It is perhaps inevitable that dissatisfaction should have been felt by the local authorities at losses sustained through the reduction of costs, which are not in all cases controlled by officers of their own, but which, nevertheless, the county or borough treasurer is compelled by statute to pay at sight, on the production of an order of the court.

On the other hand, some examination of these claims appears to have been imperatively called for, by the fact that within two or three years of the time when a Vote was taken to repay these costs in full, and they were paid without any scrutiny, they were found to exceed by more than a fifth the amount of the

average of the preceding years, when a moiety only was repaid, without, as far as is known, any increase of crime or other cause to account legitimately for the difference.

The course of examination, moreover, pursued by the Treasury was based upon principles entirely analogous to those which govern the distribution of all public money under the authority of this Board, the object being to see that the claims preferred were such as the Vote was intended to meet, that they were properly vouched and explained, and were in conformity with the authorised scales and regulations.

Any failure to satisfy these conditions necessarily entailed the reduction or disallowance of the claim as against the Vote, and although the jurisdiction might feel this as a hardship, it must be observed that the Treasury was in no sense directly represented at the original ascertainment of the allowances which it had undertaken to repay, nor does it appear, having regard to the number of separate courts which are periodically held in the counties and boroughs of England, that it would be practicable to devise any plan to enable Treasury officers to assist generally at the taxation, except at a cost so great as entirely to preclude the adoption of such a course.

In deciding as to the alterations of the present practice which it will be desirable to introduce, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to leave the payment of these costs (as the statute has placed it) upon local funds, but in providing for the reimbursement of the local purse, he would draw a distinction between the costs incurred in cases at assizes and at sessions respectively.

At the assizes the "proper officer" of the court by whom the costs are ascertained and allowed is the clerk of assize, or in the counties palatine of Lancashire and Durham, the clerks of the Crown. These officers cannot, in the ordinary acceptation of the words, be termed officers of the Government or of the Treasury. The clerks of assize are appointed by the senior judge on the circuit for the time being, and are understood to hold their offices for life; they are officers of the court and responsible to the judge for the proper conduct of the administrative business of the assizes, and their only relation to the Treasury consists, since they have been remunerated by salary in lieu of fees, in the fixing of that salary, and in the payment of it from a Vote which is administered by the Treasury.

The clerks of the Crown are equally, in the exercise of their functions, independent of Treasury control.

On the other hand, if the clerks of assize are not officers of the Treasury, they are still less amenable in their taxation to the local authorities of the counties and boroughs which they visit at the time when the assizes are held; and experience has shown that although they will not refuse to answer inquiries preferred by the local authorities as to any matter connected with costs on which the Treasury might desire explanation, they do not consider it a part of their duty to supply this information.

The result, therefore, of any reduction of costs which have been allowed by a clerk of assize, and paid by the local treasurer on his certificate, whether such reduction arises from defective information or from deviations from a scale, is to impose a loss upon the Jurisdiction in a matter over which it has no control, and for which it cannot be held responsible in the same degree as if the taxation had been conducted by an officer of its own.

For these reasons it has been decided that in all cases in which a claim is preferred to repayments of costs authorised by Courts of Oyer and Terminer and general gaol delivery, such repayment shall, from the time appointed for giving effect to this regulation, be made to the Jurisdiction in full, subject however to the following conditions,—that the claims are preferred half-yearly in the same manner as at present, accompanied by the Orders of Court and certificates in proper form, with the receipts of the witnesses attached for the payments made to them, and that the offence specified in the Order is one in respect of which the statutes give costs, or in which the costs have hitherto been regarded as repayable from the grant of Parliament.

Although no examination of the Orders and certificates will be made with a view to the disallowance or reduction of any items which they may contain, my Lords consider it highly desirable that such examination should still be instituted for the purpose of detecting and noting any errors or deviations from authorised scales and regulations which may be found in such Orders.

They

They have recently been furnished with particulars of the disallowances made under several heads in the years 1872 and 1873, and they find that in the first of these years the sums disallowed from Orders at the assizes, owing to errors in the certificates, and non-observance of the scales and regulations of the Secretary of State, amounted to 605 *l.*, and in the year 1873 to 582 *l.* It will, therefore, be apparent that although the jurisdictions are no longer to bear any losses arising from errors of this description in assize cases, it will be necessary in the interests of the public funds to guard as far as possible against the recurrence or increase of irregular payments of this nature, and my Lords reserve to themselves to consider how this can best be effected.

It must, however, be observed in the next place that if the taxation at assizes is not conducted by officers responsible to the local jurisdictions, the same cannot be said to be the case at the sessions. The taxing officers are there the clerks of the peace, who, in counties are appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, but are subject to dismissal by the justices in quarter sessions, and in boroughs are appointed by the town councils, and who are therefore amenable to the local authorities for the proper discharge of their duties.

It does not appear that the irregularities which have caused disallowances from the claims at assizes are less noticeable in cases at the sessions. My Lords find, on referring to the particulars of disallowances before mentioned, that in 1872, sums amounting altogether to 2,551 *l.* were disallowed on account of errors in the certificates, and non-observance of the scales, in sessions cases, while in 1873, the disallowances from the same causes amounted to 2,425 *l.* The attention of the local authorities has been repeatedly drawn to the necessity of a proper observance of scales and regulations in the ascertainment of costs, but not with entire success, as those figures show.

The considerations which have prompted the Government to repay the costs at assizes without holding the local authorities responsible for errors which may have been committed, do not apply in the same degree to the costs at sessions, where the taxation is conducted by local officers; and if the present system of examination and disallowance is not to be continued as regards these latter costs, it will be better, with a view to prevent irregular claims on the one hand, and on the other, to allay the dissatisfaction which is now felt by the jurisdictions that the repayment in sessions cases should be adjusted on the principle of a commuted sum for each prosecution, ascertained by taking a separate average for each county and borough of the number of prosecutions, and of the amounts allowed in previous years.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer recommends to the Board to adopt an arrangement of this nature, which should, he considers, come into effect at the same time as the full repayment of the costs in assize cases. My Lords agree with this recommendation, and will take steps to carry it out.

It appears to their Lordships that a similar mode of repayment may also well be adopted for cases under the Criminal Justice and Juvenile Offenders' Acts, as in these cases the fees and rates of allowance should be very nearly uniform throughout England.

My Lords consider that the commuted sum to be allowed henceforth for each prosecution at sessions and under the summary statutes, should be ascertained by taking the number of prosecutions in the three years preceding the 30th June 1874, in each separate jurisdiction, and the amounts allowed, after examination at the Treasury, to the jurisdiction in respect thereof during the same period, and dividing the second by the first, the result will give the sum to be allowed for each prosecution for the future, irrespective of the number of prisoners which such prosecution may embrace.

It will be possible in this way to effect a near approximation to the payments which have been hitherto made; and in their Lordships' opinion the experiment should be tried for three years, at the end of which time it is to be understood that it will be open to revision, by taking a fresh average of the actual costs of the then preceding three years, should circumstances appear to call for it.

It will be necessary that the claims for cases at sessions and under the summary statutes should be sent to the Treasury half-yearly, as heretofore, accompanied by the vouchers.

No examination of the latter will be made with a view to disallowance or reduction,

reduction, but the examination will be limited to seeing that the Order is (as in cases at the assizes before referred to) in proper form, and that the offence specified therein is one in respect of which the statutes give costs, or in which the costs have hitherto been repaid from the Vote of Parliament. If these conditions are satisfied, the commuted sum will then be allowed in respect of each prosecution.

The vouchers in these cases will in the first instance be retained for statistical purposes, and with a view to a possible revision at the end of three years, but every facility will be afforded to any Jurisdiction which may desire to inspect them, or to have them returned.

My Lords will hereafter cause the decision at which Her Majesty's Government have arrived in regard to the manner of repaying costs of prosecutions, and which is set forth in this Minute, to be notified to the several Jurisdictions; and they are of opinion that, with a view to uniformity, it will be desirable that the new system should commence in every case with the payments for the half year ending 31st December 1874, the vouchers for which are now in course of transmission to the Treasury, and the examination and repayment of which would not, in ordinary course, be completed before the commencement of the next financial year.

The interval which will elapse will not be more than sufficient to enable an average to be taken for the purposes of the repayment in sessions cases.

There is one further point in respect of which their Lordships feel that some action is imperatively required, with a view not only to prevent loss to the Jurisdictions, but also to guard the public purse against irregular claims. They refer to the number of instances in which, under Tables still in force, obsolete and irregular fees are paid to clerks of the peace and justices' clerks. The only result of such Tables is that in Jurisdictions where they still are found the expense of a prosecution is much greater than in other localities where the authorities have had their Tables revised to adopt them to modern law and practice. In their Lordships' opinion, these differences cannot any longer be defended.

The Secretary of State has established an uniform scale of allowances to prosecutors and witnesses, under the Act of 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55; and he has power, under the Act of 11 & 12 Vict. c. 43, to settle tables of fees for clerks of the peace and justices' clerks, upon the same being submitted to him by the justices in quarter sessions, and by the councils in boroughs, but he is unable to take the initiative in such revision. It was proposed by the Public Prosecutors' Bill to make it compulsory on all Jurisdictions to send up their tables to the Home Office for revision within a defined period, and their Lordships trust that Legislation with this object will be again attempted, so as to insure, as far as possible, uniformity of allowance in these tables.

CRIMINAL LAW ACCOUNTS.

COPY of TREASURY MINUTE, dated 29 January 1875, on the subject of the Examination, prior to Repayment, of the Accounts of Costs incurred, by Counties and Boroughs in *England* in PROSECUTIONS at Assizes and Sessions, and under the SUMMARY JURISDICTION ACT.

(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
19 March 1875.

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons
dated 23 July 1874;—for,

“RETURN of the PERSONS Imprisoned for Sums exceeding £.50 each in
the Year 1873; with the Names of the respective PRISONERS; the
PRISONS in which they were Confined; the Periods for which they were
respectively Imprisoned; and the Names of the JUDGES who Imprisoned
them.”

Home Office, Whitehall, }
12 February 1875. }

(Mr. Bass.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
15 February 1875.

RETURN of the PERSONS Imprisoned for Sums exceeding £. 50 each in the Year 1873, with the Names of the respective PRISONERS, the PRISONS in which they were confined, the Periods for which they were respectively Imprisoned, and the Names of the JUDGES who Imprisoned them.

COUNTY, AND NAME OF PRISON.	Name of Prisoner.	Amount of Debt for which Imprisoned.	Number of Days for which he was Committed.	Number of Days for which he was Imprisoned.	Name of Judge by whom he was Imprisoned.
ENGLAND:					
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE:		£. s. d.			
Aylesbury - - County Prison	William Marsh - -	56 - 8	28	28	J. Whigham, esq., County Court Judge for Berkshire.
CORNWALL:					
Bodmin - - - County Prison	Edmund Paull * - -	50 9 3	Till order of Court	9	County Court of Cornwall
	F. J. Williams * - -	60 6 -	- - ditto - -	11	Truro; warrants issued by J. G. Chilcott, esq., County Court Registrar.
DERBYSHIRE:					
Derby - - - County Prison	John Drakefield - -	55 13 10	10	10	George Russell, esq.
GLOUCESTERSHIRE:					
Gloucester - - County Prison	Michael Cook - -	62 7 2	40	15	C. Sumner, esq., Cheltenham County Court, Sheriff's order.
	Edward Huntley Stone -	100 - -	Until payment -	21	
Bristol - City Common Prison	Stamford Perrott Parker	51 13 5	Unlimited - -	57	Court of Queen's Bench.
	Edward Sanders Craymer (Absconding debtor).	62 9 -	- ditto - -	5	- Lloyd, esq., County Court Judge, Bristol.
	William Burston - - (Absconding debtor).	180 17 4	- ditto - -	23	- ditto - - ditto.
HERTFORDSHIRE:					
Hertford - - - County Prison	Alfred Dodd - - -	54 - 11	28	28	J. Whigham, esq.
LANCASHIRE:					
Lancaster - - - County Prison	John Howarth - -	109 3 8	42	42	W. R. Grove.
	Edward Druiff - -	† 417 14 1	183	14	G. Denuan.
	Lees Wrigley - -	72 - -	42	40	James Hannen.
	Rosina Sophia Thompson	68 17 6	42	41	George Honyman.
	James Holty - -	† 136 16 7	122	17	Samuel Martin.
	Henry Thornton - -	† 80 - -	183	6	George Denman.
Manchester - - - City Gaol	William Manley - -	52 17 2	40	39	Joseph Kay, esq.
				40th day was Sunday.	
LEICESTERSHIRE:					
Leicester - - - County Prison	W. F. Coare - - -	57 1 6	8	8	Mr. Serjeant Miller.
	Tom Coare - - -	57 1 6	8	8	Mr. Serjeant Miller.
LINCOLNSHIRE:					
Lincoln - - - County Gaol	George Rouse - - -	63 1 9	42	42	Baron Bramwell.
MIDDLESEX:					
Holloway City and Debtors' Prison	George Early - - -	63 17 10 and 13 16 9	40 and 28 days -	Served 40 days -	County Court Judge of Yeovil, Somerset, and Clerkenwell.
	John Baker - - -	53 5 -	14 days - -	Paid, after serving two days.	Transfer from County Court of Hampshire holden at Portsmouth.
	Samuel Wilkins - -	79 10 4	Until payment -	Discharged by order from Court of Queen's Bench after serving 50 days.	Judges, Court of Queen's Bench.
	Henry Hardy Ongley -	1,351 1 3	- - ditto - -	Discharged by Middlesex Sheriffs after three days.	Chancellor, High Court of Chancery.
	James Chilton - -	186 16 8	6 weeks - -	31 days - -	Mr. Justice Quain.
	George Borman Skipworth	500 - -	3 calendar months and pay 500 l.	Served the 3 months and payed.	Lord Chief Justice.
	Elizabeth E. Hobson -	72 9 2	6 weeks - -	11 days - -	Mr. Justice Lush.
	William Philip Thomas	174 18 -	6 weeks - -	Served time - -	Mr. Justice Brett.
	Charles Champeleivers -	77 - -	No time; until he pays the amount.	Served 12 calendar months.	Marylebone County Court.
	Frederick Roskins - -	300 - -	6 months, or find two sureties in 300 l. each.	Served 9 days - -	Mr. Justice Mellor.

* Imprisoned in consequence of supposition they were about to go abroad to avoid payment.

† Security for the amount on himself and two sureties.

RETURN of the Persons Imprisoned for Sums exceeding £ 50. each in the Year 1873, &c.—*continued.*

COUNTY, AND NAME OF PRISON.	Name of Prisoner.	Amount of Debt for which Imprisoned.	Number of Days for which he was Committed.	Number of Days for which he was Imprisoned.	Name of Judge by whom he was Imprisoned.
ENGLAND—continued.					
MIDDLESEX—continued.		£. s. d.			
Holloway City and Debtors' Prison —continued.	Marshall Turner - -	614 15 4	Unlimited - -	Served 12 calendar months.	Chancery.
	Edwarde Alvernez Toledo	541 6 5	2 months, or find two sureties for 1,082 <i>l.</i> 12 <i>s.</i> 10 <i>d.</i>	2	Baron Martin.
	Alexander Patterson -	61 19 8	6 weeks - -	Served time - -	Mr. Justice Blackburn.
	William Reynolds - -	2,400 - -	No time; until he pays amount.	94	Commissioners of Inland Revenue.
	Moses Auker - - -	50,000 - -	3 months, or two sureties in 50,000 <i>l.</i> each.	3	Baron Cleasby.
	William Pamphill - -	55 15 -	14 days - -	Served time - -	Whitechapel and Shore- ditch County Court.
	Benjamin Harriison -	70 - -	3 months - -	2	Mr. Justice Bovill.
	Daniel Green - - -	131 14 4	6 weeks - -	9	Mr. Justice Honyman.
NORTHUMBERLAND:					
Newcastle-upon-Tyne - { Town Prison }	Wm. A. Leggatt - -	78 - -	6 weeks - -	1	The Right Hon. Sir James Hannay.
Berwick-upon-Tweed { Borough Prison }	James Cockburn - -	69 19 1	40	40	Thomas Bradshaw.
SOUTHAMPTON:					
Southampton - Town Prison	George Maidment - -	58 15 3	40	40	C. J. Gale, esq., County Court Judge.
SUFFOLK:					
Ipswich - - - County Gaol	Naylor James Sadler -	1,428 19 5	42	27	Baron Martin.
SURREY:					
Newington - - - County Prison	W. J. Van Hoogenbuzzen	242 - -	56	4	Mr. Justice Grove.
	Henry Geeves - - -	60 7 4	21	21	Wandsworth County Court.
	John Season Burgess Budgett.	183 1 8	42	17	Mr. Justice Quain.
SUSSEX:					
Lewes - - - County Prison	Stephen Lonergan - -	4,750 - -	Until bail found -	5	Under a writ from the Court of Chancery.
WARWICKSHIRE:					
Warwick - - - County Prison	George Parkes - - -	51 9 4	10	10	Atherstone County Court.
	William Warren - - -	50 5 6	40	40	Coventry County Court.
	J. V. Seltzer - - -	53 1 -	6 months - -	18	Court of Common Pleas.
	William Bromley - - -	268 - -	4 months - -	4	Court of Exchequer.
Birmingham - Borough Prison	Thomas D. Lloyd - -	250 - -	56	6	H. W. Cole, q.c.
WORCESTERSHIRE:					
Worcester - - - County Prison	Martin Lucy - - -	142 7 -	42	5	Sir James Hannen.
	Francis Edward Holyoake	524 12 10	42	42	Mr. Justice Denman.
YORKSHIRE:					
York - - - County Prison	Edward Pilkington - -	56 5 2	6 weeks - -	6 weeks - -	W. Raine, esq.
	Squire Mountain - - -	55 - 2	30	30	T. H. Marshall, esq.
	George Scholey - - -	54 7 -	40	40	Thomas Ellison, esq.
WALES:					
ANGLESEY:					
Beaumaris - - - County Prison	Owen Owens - - -	55 6 -	21	21	William Hughes, Registrar of the Carnarvonshire County Court.
CARMARTHENSHIRE:					
Carmarthen - - - County Prison	Jenkin Jones Thomas*	1,008 11 8	Unlimited - -	772	The Right Hon. John Lord Romilly, Master of the Rolls.
GLAMORGANSHIRE:					
Cardiff - - - County Prison	Thomas David - - -	175 12 -	42	5	Baron Martin.

* This prisoner was delivered into the custody of the governor for a contempt of Court in not delivering certain documents, as ordered, on the 29th April 1872; and on the 3rd of May following, in same suit, was ordered to pay 1,008*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* He continued in prison under these warrants till 10th June 1874.

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.

RETURN of the PERSONS Imprisoned for Sums exceeding £. 50 each in the Year 1873; with the Names of the respective PRISONERS; the PRISONS in which they were Confined; the Periods for which they were respectively Imprisoned; and the Names of the JUDGES who Imprisoned them.

(*Mr. Bass.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
15 February 1875.*

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 19 March 1875;—for,

“RETURN, giving the NAMES and PROFESSIONS of all the JUSTICES OF THE PEACE in the various BOROUGHs and CITIES in *England* and *Wales*, on the 1st day of March 1875, with the Dates of their Appointments; showing where any of them had become Non-Resident, or had ceased from any other cause for a Year or upwards to attend the Bench.”

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Aberavon	William Llewellyn Powell	Gentleman	16 Dec. 1865	Non-resident.
	Edward Jones	Provision Merchant	16 Dec. "	
	David Jenkins	Coal Merchant	16 Dec. "	
	John David	Grocer	1 Feb. 1869.	Non-acting.
	Thomas Jenkins	Retired Tin-plate Manufacturer.	1 Feb. "	
	Thomas Davies Daniel	Tin-plate Manufacturer	28 Feb. 1873.	
	William Whitelaw	Confectioner	28 Feb. "	
	Evan Evans	Chemist	28 Feb. "	
Aberystwyth	Philip Williams (Mayor, <i>ex officio</i>).	Printer and Stationer	- Nov. 1874.	Yes. Non-acting.
	Thomas Jones	Merchant	1840.	
	John Davies	Gentleman	1861.	
	Richard Roberts	Merchant	1861.	
	John Roberts	Gentleman	1861	
Abingdon	Edwin Payne	Miller	4 Dec. 1862.	
	Charles Payne	Silversmith	21 Jan. 1869.	
	John Creemer Clarke, M.P.	Clothier	21 Jan. "	
	John Tomkins	Draper	21 Jan. "	
	John Kent	Carrier	3 July 1873.	
	William Stacey	Farmer	3 July "	
	John Thornhill Morland (Mayor).	Solicitor	9 Nov. 1874.	
Andover	Henry Thompson	Coal Merchant	1843.	Non-resident; non-acting.
	Henry James Bracher	Gentleman	1861.	
	Edward Bishop Hawkins	Draper	1861	
	Francis Bamtree	Corn Merchant	1867	
	Giles Westbury	Land Surveyor	1867.	
	Turner Poulter Clarke	Surveyor	1867.	
	Thomas Heard Mortimore	Tanner	1869.	
	Robert Dowling (Mayor)	Wine Merchant	1874.	
	William Henry Parsons (ex-Mayor).	Draper	1873.	
Ashton-under-Lyne	Benjamin Mellor Kenworthy	Gentleman	3 Nov. 1849	All resident and acting except Mr. George Heginbottom, who resides at Southport, and has not acted for upwards of a year, but being a ratepayer, he is qualified under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 75, s. 3.
	George Heginbottom	Cotton Manufacturer	2 Aug. 1858	
	John Knott	Cotton Spinner	5 May 1851	
	Hugh Mason	ditto	3 Nov. 1860	
	Thomas Walton Mellor	Member of Parliament	21 June 1858	
	Nathaniel Buckley	Cotton Manufacturer	2 Aug. "	
	James Kershaw	Cotton Spinner	21 June "	
	Francis Aylmer Frost	ditto	24 Dec. 1863	
	Joseph Smethurst	Engineer	24 Dec. "	
	Nathaniel Buckley Sutcliffe	Cotton Spinner	24 Dec. "	
	L. Andrew	ditto	24 Dec. "	
	John Galt	Surgeon	13 Feb. 1866	
	John Charlesworth	Gentleman	13 Feb. "	
	Thomas Heginbottom	Cotton Spinner	8 Jan. 1867	
	John Cryer	ditto	8 Jan. "	
	Samuel Duncuft Lees	Doctor of Medicine	8 Jan. "	
	Henry Gartside	Solicitor	8 Jan. "	
	John Moss	Gentleman	8 Jan. "	
	Joseph Moxon Clementson	Cotton Spinner	15 Mar. "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Ashton-under-Lyne— <i>continued.</i>	William Smith Buckley -	Cotton Manufacturer -	6 April 1869	All resident and acting except Mr. George Heginbottom, who resides at Southport, and has not acted for upwards of a year, but being a ratepayer, he is qualified under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 75, s. 3.
	George Heath Bancroft -	Provision Merchant -	29 April 1872	
	George Henry Kenworthy -	Cotton Spinner -	6 April 1869	
	James Buckley -	Cotton Manufacturer -	1 May 1873	
	W. E. M. H. Harrop -	Out of business -	1 May "	
	John Fletcher -	Gentleman -	18 Dec. "	
	William Henry Buckley -	Cotton Spinner -	18 Dec. "	
	John Frederick Knott -	- ditto -	18 Dec. "	
	Thomas Radley, M.A. -	Clerk in Holy Orders -	1 June 1874	
	James Hulme -	Gentleman -	1 June "	
	George Harry Mellor -	Cotton Spinner -	1 June "	
Banbury -	John Golby Rusher -	Printer and Stationer -	1842 -	Non-acting.
	Edward Cobb -	Esquire -	1851 -	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Robert Field -	Miller -	1851 -	Non-acting.
	Edward Bennett -	Gentleman -	1859 -	Non-acting.
	William Thomas Douglas -	Surgeon -	1859 -	
	Alfred Gillett -	Banker -	1859 -	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	John Harlock -	Draper -	1869 -	
	John Griffin -	Surgeon -	1869 -	
	John Philips Barford -	Ironmonger -	1875 -	
	William Rusher -	Actuary -	1875 -	
	Joseph Malsbury -	Grocer -	1875 -	
	Richard Edmunds -	Seedsman -	1875 -	
	Thomas Beesley -	Chemist -	1875 -	
Barnstaple -	John Morris Fisher -	Maltster -	13 May 1852	Non-acting.
	John May Miller -	Lace Manufacturer -	4 June 1860	Acting.
	Richard Budd -	Physician -	- June 1860	Non-acting.
	Thomas Lambe Willshire -	Ironfounder -	- April 1864	
	Henry Dene -	Banker -	- Sept. 1866	Acting.
	George Brown -	Land Agent -	16 April 1874	
	Charles Crassweller -	China Merchant -	16 April "	
	Thomas William Matthew Wilks Guppy.	Banker -	16 April "	
Basingstoke -	Robert Skeat Hulbert -	Chemist -	Nov. 1858 -	Non-resident for more than a year.
	Charles Webb -	Surgeon -	Feb. 1862 -	
	Henry Downs -	Estate Agent -	Oct. 1866 -	
	Robert Archer Davis -	Engineer and Surveyor -	Oct. "	
	Richard Wallis -	Corn Merchant -	Oct. "	
	William Pistell (Mayor for the time being).	Builder -	By commission, dated 14 Nov. 1837.	
	Arthur Wallis (ex-Mayor)	Ironfounder -	Under 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 76, s. 57.	
Bath -	William Thomas Blair -	Esquire -	1 Jan. 1836	Non-resident, and non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Philip Charles Sheppard -	- ditto -	- Nov. 1845.	
	William Hunt -	- ditto -	- Aug. 1847.	
	Thomas Gill -	Gentleman -	- Mar. 1852.	Non-resident, and non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Randle Wilbraham Falconer -	Doctor of Medicine -	- April 1858.	
	Thomas Richard Baker -	Major -	- April "	
	John Evans -	Captain -	- April "	
	Robert Nathaniel Stone -	Surgeon -	- April "	
	Charles John Vigne -	Esquire -	- April "	
	John Randle Ford -	Lieutenant Colonel -	- April "	
	Edward Marsh -	Captain -	- June 1859.	
	Thomas William Saunders (Recorder).	Barrister-at-Law -	- Oct. 1860.	
	Thomas Jolly -	Silk Mercer -	- Jan. 1864.	
	Thomas Fuller -	Gentleman -	- Jan. "	
	George Annesley Phayre -	Captain, R.N. -	- Jan. "	
	Anthony Hammond -	Esquire -	- Dec. 1866.	
	George Moger -	Banker -	- Dec. "	
	Charles Milsom -	Gentleman -	- Dec. "	
	Charles Frederick Marshall -	- ditto -	- Dec. "	
	John Stothert Bartrum -	Surgeon -	- Dec. "	
	William Allen -	Esquire -	- Sept. 1870.	
	William Thompson -	Estate Agent -	- Sept. "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Batley	William Brooke (as Mayor only).	Merchant	1873, as Mayor	No.
	John Jubb	Manufacturer	1868	
	Robert Dex Keighley	Surgeon	1868	
	Thomas Brearley	Merchant	1868	
	Thomas Taylor	Manufacturer	1868	
	John Sheard	Retired Manufacturer	1868	
	Henry Wharton	ditto	1868	
Bedford	John Howard	Esquire		Resident, and acting.
	William Wells Kilpin	Gentleman	1860	
	George Hurst	Esquire	1860	
	Edwin Heath	Captain	1863	
	Augustus Edgar Burch	Esquire	1863	Resident, and acting.
	Robert Couchman	ditto	1865	
	William Hugh Jackson	ditto	1865	
	Thomas Jobson Jackson	ditto	1865	
	Thomas Simmons Trapp	Banker	1866	Resident; non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Frederick Howard	Ironfounder	1867	
	John Richard Bull	Gentleman		
	James Tacey Wing	ditto		
	James Coombs	Esquire	1875	Resident, and acting.
	John Elworthy Cutcliffe	ditto	1875	
	Edmond Robert Green	ditto	1875	
	Moses Rogers	ditto	1875	
Berwick-upon-Tweed	Robert Ramsey	Gentleman	1855	Non-resident.
	William Hugh Logan	Late Banker	1858	
	Ralph Forster	Barrister-at-Law	1858.	
	Robert Thompson	Draper and Farmer	1859.	
	Alexander Robinson Lowrey	Borough Treasurer, Farmer, and Land Agent.	1859.	Non-acting.
	Andrew Thompson	Ironmonger, Farmer, and Shipowner.	1864.	
	Thomas Allan	Timber Merchant	1864	
	Alexander Robertson	Ironfounder	1864.	
	Robert Carr Fluker	Medical Practitioner	1867.	Non-acting.
	Henry Richardson, M.D.	Retired Navy Surgeon	1867	
	James Purves (Mayor 1874-5 and 1872-3).	Cabinet Maker	Nov. - 1872.	
	George Young (Mayor 1873-4).	Fishmonger and Grocer	Nov. - 1873.	
Beverley	Robert George Boulton	Surgeon	30 Jan. 1842	All resident, and acting.
	Harold Barkworth	Esquire	1858	
	John Almack	ditto	1858	
	Thomas Cussens	Tanner	1858	
	John Brigleam	Merchant	1858	
	Alfred Crosskell	Ironfounder	July - 1873	
	William Whytehead Boulton	Surgeon	July - "	
	Thomas Stephenson	Farmer	July - "	
	William Catterson	Tanner	July - "	
Bewdley	Henry Walker, Esq.	Doctor of Medicine	July - "	All resident, and acting.
	John Nicholls	Gentleman	Mar. - 1865	
	John Gabb	Surgeon	Dec. - "	
	Alfred Maurice Clinch	Bank Manager	Jan. - 1867	
	Thomas Baugh	Gentleman	Feb. - "	
	William Nichols Marcy	Solicitor	Sept. - 1874	
Bideford	Thomas Evans	Retired Merchant	1851	All resident, and acting.
	John Thompson	Doctor of Medicine	1857	
	John How	Merchant	1865	
	William Henry Ackland	Doctor of Medicine	1865	
	William Turner	Merchant	1874	
	Henry Tardrew	ditto	1874	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Birmingham	Philip Henry Muntz, M.P.	Merchant	Feb. 1839	Non-acting.
	John Birt Davies, Boro' Coroner.	Doctor of Medicine	Feb. 1839	
	Howard Luckcock	Gentleman	May 1841	
	John Barrett Melson	Doctor of Medicine	May 1841	
	Thomas Phillips	Gentleman	Dec. 1849.	Non-acting. Non-resident.
	Samuel Thornton	Merchant	Dec. 1849.	
	David Malins	ditto	Dec. 1849.	
	William Lucas Sargent	Manufacturer	Dec. 1849.	
	William Lucy	Bank Manager	Dec. 1849.	Non-acting.
	Samuel Buckley	Merchant	April 1856.	
	William Middlemore	Manufacturer	April 1856.	
	Charles Sturge	Corn Merchant	Feb. 1859.	Non-acting. Non-resident.
	Thomas Lane	Manufacturer	Feb. 1859.	
	Sampson S. Lloyd, M.P.	Gentleman	Feb. 1859.	
	Samuel Rawlins	ditto	Feb. 1859.	
	William Holliday	Linendraper	April 1864.	Non-acting.
	George Dixon, M.P.	Merchant	April 1864.	
	Thomas Lloyd	Gentleman	April 1864.	
	Henry Wiggin	Manufacturer	Oct. 1865.	
	Henry Manton	Gentleman	Oct. 1865.	
	Thomas Avery	ditto	Oct. 1865.	
	Hector Richard Cooksey	ditto	Oct. 1865.	
	George Goodrich	ditto	Oct. 1865.	
	John Dent Goodman	Merchant	Oct. 1865.	
	John Jaffray	Newspaper Proprietor	Oct. 1865.	
	John Skirrow Wright	Manufacturer	Mar. 1874.	
	Ambrose Biggs	ditto	Dec. 1874.	
	Joseph Chamberlain	Gentleman	Dec. 1874.	
	John Chesshire	Surveyor	Dec. 1874.	
	Alfred John Elkington	Manufacturer	Dec. 1874.	
	William Medlicott Ellis	ditto	Dec. 1874.	
	Thomas Bell Elcock Fletcher	Doctor of Medicine	Dec. 1874.	
	Ralph Heaton	Manufacturer	Dec. 1874.	
	Thomas Pretious Heslop	Doctor of Medicine	Dec. 1874.	
	John Satchell Hopkins	Manufacturer	Dec. 1874.	
	William Kenrick	ditto	Dec. 1874.	
	George Braithwaite Lloyd	Gentleman	Dec. 1874.	
	John Lowe	Manufacturer	Dec. 1874.	
	Edward Corn. Osborne	Printer and Stationer	Dec. 1874.	
	Henry Richards	Merchant	Dec. 1874.	
	Samuel Timmins	Manufacturer	Dec. 1874.	
Blackburn	William Coddington, Esq., (Mayor).	Cotton Spinner, &c.		Non-acting.
	John Rickop, ex-Mayor	Solicitor.		
	James Fisher Armistead	Gentleman	26 July 1869	
	James Astley	Cotton Manufacturer	23 July 1874.	
	Thomas Bury	Gentleman	9 Jan. 1867.	
	Aaron S. Bury	Cotton Spinner and Manufacturer.	23 July 1874.	
	James Briggs	ditto ditto	26 July 1869.	Non-resident.
	Adam Bullough	Cotton Manufacturer	18 Dec. 1868.	
	Jos. Constantine	Gentleman	2 Aug. 1871	
	Richard B. Dodgson	ditto	7 July 1858	
	Robert Duckworth	ditto	10 Jan. 1867.	Non-acting.
	John Dugdale, jun.	Ironfounder	26 July 1869	
	Edward Dugdale	ditto	2 Aug. 1871.	
	James Dickinson	Cotton Spinner and Manufacturer.	23 July 1874.	
	Henry A. Grime	Doctor of Medicine	April 1872.	
	R. H. Hutchinson	Cotton Spinner, &c.	Sept. 1862.	
	Thomas Higson	Cotton Manufacturer	2 Aug. 1871.	
	Eli Heyworth	ditto	April 1874.	
	James Johnston	Tea Merchant	4 Oct. 1862.	
	Francis Johnston	Cotton Manufacturer	26 July 1869.	
	James Lewis	Cotton Spinner, &c.	9 Jan. 1867.	
	Thomas Lund	Cotton Broker	1 July 1858	
				Non-acting, and disqualified.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Blackburn—continued	Henry Patchett - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	2 Aug. 1871.	Non-resident.
	William Pilkington - - -	Gentleman - - -	25 Aug. 1852.	
	Henry Polding - - -	Corn Miller - - -	9 Jan. 1867.	
	William Polding - - -	Commission Agent - - -	26 April 1869	
	Thomas H. Pickey - - -	Druggist - - -	23 July 1874.	
	Richard Shackleton - - -	Corn Miller - - -	11 June 1860.	
	Henry Shaw - - -	Brewer - - -	26 July 1869.	
	James Thompson - - -	Cotton Spinner, &c. - - -	9 Jan. 1867.	
	Edward Wharton - - -	Gentleman - - -	26 July 1869.	
Bodmin* - - -	James Liddell - - -	Retired Commander, R.N. - - -	13 Aug. 1850	Resident, and acting.
	Joseph Oke - - -	Retired Draper - - -	8 June 1869	
Bolton - - -	Henry Ashworth - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	18 Feb. 1839	Non-acting.
	William Ford Hulton - - -	Esquire - - -	16 Nov. 1846	Neither.
	James Knowles - - -	Gentleman - - -	20 Jan. 1848	
	William Gray - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	22 Aug. 1850	Non-acting.
	John Cannon - - -	- - ditto - - -	19 June 1858	Non-resident.
	Thomas Ridgway Bridson - - -	Bleacher - - -	25 June "	Neither.
	Samuel Taylor Chadwick - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	30 Sept. "	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	William Makant - - -	Bleacher - - -	12 Nov. 1860	Neither.
	James Rawsthorne Wolfenden - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	4 Dec. "	Non-acting.
	Thomas Wood Heaton - - -	- - ditto - - -	14 April 1863	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	John Harwood - - -	- - ditto - - -	15 April "	Neither.
	Richard Stockdale - - -	Gentleman - - -	12 Jan. 1867	
	William Walter Cannon - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	19 Jan. "	
	William Henry Wright - - -	Tea Merchant - - -	19 Jan. "	
	George Fell - - -	Leather Dealer - - -	19 Jan. "	
	Joseph Musgrave - - -	Engineer and Ironfounder - - -	28 Mar. "	
	Thomas Hesketh - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	17 July 1868	
	John Green - - -	Gentleman - - -	17 July "	
	John Livy - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	17 July "	
	Thomas Walmsley - - -	Iron Merchant - - -	25 July "	
	Joseph Crook - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	4 Sept. 1869	
	James Barlow - - -	- - ditto - - -	6 Sept. "	
	Fergus Ferguson - - -	Surgeon - - -	16 Sept. "	
	John Kynaston Cross - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	9 April 1874	
	Charles Heaton - - -	- - ditto - - -	9 April "	
	Charles Taylor - - -	- - ditto - - -	9 April "	
	Stephen Winkworth - - -	- - ditto - - -	22 April "	
Boston - - -	James Edward Tuxford - - -	Surgeon - - -	- Sept. 1841	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Francis Thirkill White - - -	Solicitor - - -	7 June 1852.	Non-resident.
	Edward Coupland - - -	Surgeon - - -	9 July 1858.	
	John Caruthers Little - - -	- ditto - - -	10 Sept. "	
	Joseph Wren - - -	Corn Merchant - - -	5 Nov. "	
	Thomas Small - - -	Surgeon - - -	17 June 1861.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	John Oldrid - - -	Draper - - -	16 May 1862	
	Joseph Harpham Small - - -	- ditto - - -	2 April 1864.	
	John Cabourn Simonds - - -	Seed Merchant - - -	2 April "	
	Adam Young - - -	Surgeon - - -	2 April "	
	William Caister - - -	Hop Merchant and Maltster. - - -	3 May 1867.	
	Walter Clegg - - -	Surgeon - - -	3 May "	
	Farndon Groom - - -	Gentleman - - -	14 Nov. 1873.	
	James Thorns - - -	Draper - - -	14 Nov. "	
	William John Pilcher - - -	Surgeon - - -	14 Nov. "	
	Arthur Tuxford - - -	- ditto - - -	22 Jan. 1875.	
	Thomas Slator, the younger - - -	Guano Merchant - - -	22 Jan. "	
	Thomas Kitwood - - -	Grocer and Wine and Spirit Merchant. - - -	22 Jan. "	
	William Haigh Bailey (ex-Mayor). - - -	Solicitor - - -	- - -	

* Three Borough Magistrates have died within the last four years, viz.: 1871, John Ward; 1874, Henry Mudge; 1875, George Pentire Parkyn.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Bradford - - -	Sir Titus Salt, Bart. - - - -	Spinner and Manufacturer	19 S ept. 1848	Not acted for many years. Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	H. W. Ripley, Esq., M.P. - - - -	Dyer - - - -	19 Sept. „	
	William Garnett, Esq. - - - -	Spinner and Manufacturer	14 May 1832	Non-resident.
	William Brook Addison, Esq. - - - -	- ditto - ditto -	14 May „	
	S. C. Lister, Esq. - - - -	- ditto - ditto -	24 Sept. 1852	Never did act. Non-resident.
	John Hollings, Esq. - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	24 Sept. „	
	Henry Brown, Esq. - - - -	Outfitter - - - -	10 Nov. 1857.	Not acted for upwards of a year.
	William Dewhurst, Esq. - - - -	Merchant - - - -	19 Feb. 1859.	
	John Venimore Godwin, Esq. - - - -	- ditto - - - -	15 April 1864	Not acted for upwards of a year.
	Joseph Farrar, Esq. - - - -	Insurance Agent, &c. - - - -	15 April „	
	Charles Somon, Esq. - - - -	Merchant - - - -	22 April „	Not acted for upwards of a year.
	Richard Fawcett, Esq. - - - -	Wool Merchant - - - -	15 April 1864	
	Robert Kell, Esq. - - - -	Merchant - - - -	15 April „	Not acted for upwards of a year.
	John Gurney, Esq. - - - -	- ditto - - - -	22 April „	
	William Brayshaw, Esq. - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	10 Nov. 1866.	Not acted for upwards of a year.
	Nathaniel Briggs, Esq. - - - -	Merchant - - - -	28 May 1867	
	Edward West, Esq. - - - -	Corn Miller - - - -	28 May „	Not acted for upwards of a year.
	James Law, Esq. - - - -	Merchant - - - -	28 May „	
	Richard Henry Meade, Esq. - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	19 June „	Not acted for upwards of a year. Non-resident.
	Mark Dawson, Esq. - - - -	Worsted Spinner - - - -	10 Nov. 1869	
	Edward Hurst Wade, Esq. - - - -	Spinner and Manufacturer	17 Mar. 1871.	Non-resident.
	Silas Scott, Esq. - - - -	Manufacturer - - - -	17 Mar. „	
	Henry Mitchell, Esq. - - - -	Merchant - - - -	17 Mar. „	Not acted for upwards of a year.
Angus Holden, Esq. - - - -	Machine Wool-comber - - - -	17 Mar. „		
Brecon - - -	No return received.			
Bridgnorth - - -	Charles Deighton (Mayor) - - - -	Wine Merchant - - - -	9 Nov. 1874	} No.
	Samuel Thomas Nicholls (ex-Mayor). - - - -	Solicitor - - - -	9 Nov. 1873	
	Lord Acton - - - -	- - - -	21 May 1858	Resident, but non-acting.
	Edward Farrer Acton. - - - -	Lieutenant Colonel - - - -	21 May „	
	John Stephens - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	21 May „	Non-resident.
	Thomas Pardoe Purton - - - -	Banker - - - -	21 May „	
	Thomas Whitmore Wylde Browne. - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	21 May „	} No.
	James Brown Grierson - - - -	- ditto - - - -	21 May „	
	William Layton Lowndes - - - -	- ditto - - - -	21 May „	Non-resident.
	Thomas Martin Southwell - - - -	Carpet Manufacturer - - - -	30 May 1870	
	Francis Henry Wolryche Whitmore. - - - -	Clerk in Holy Orders - - - -	30 May „	No.
	Richard Henry Colley - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	12 June 1874	
	Alfred Matthias - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	12 June „	No.
	Thomas Milner Deighton - - - -	Chemist - - - -	12 June „	
Bridgwater - - -	Charles Thompson - - - -	Merchant - - - -	3 June 1851	Non-resident; not attended for one year.
	Carey Bailey Mogg - - - -	- ditto - - - -	13 May 1864	
	William John Ford - - - -	Banker - - - -	13 May „	Has attended the Bench.
	Henry Frederick Nicholls - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	13 May „	
	William Henry Axford - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	9 Oct. 1866	Non-resident; not attended for one year.
	Robert Salmon - - - -	Banker - - - -	9 Oct. „	
	Follett Charles Hennett - - - -	Ironfounder - - - -	9 Oct. „	Has attended the Bench.
	Cuthbert Ritson - - - -	Merchant - - - -	9 Oct. „	
	Joseph Richard Smith - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	9 Oct. „	Recently non-resident; has not attended for one year.
	Edward Lilly - - - -	Auctioneer and Surveyor - - - -	26 Mar. 1868	
	John Baptiste Hammill - - - -	Merchant - - - -	26 Mar. „	Has attended.
	Frederic Farmer - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	26 Mar. „	
	George Bryant Sully - - - -	Merchant - - - -	16 April 1872	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Bridport - - -	Thomas Collins Hounsell -	Esquire - - - - -	16 Nov., 1 Vict.	Non-acting.
	Richard Tucker - - - -	Merchant - - - - -	Appointed 1841; qualified January 1851.	
	Joseph Gundry - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	1 Jan. 1851	Non-acting.
	Stephen William Whetham -	- ditto - - - - -	1 Jan. "	
	Frederick Good - - - -	Bank Manager - - -	7 June 1858.	Non-resident.
	Charles Whetham - - - -	Merchant - - - - -	7 June "	
	William Swain - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	21 Mar. 1864	Non-acting.
	James Williams - - - -	Actuary - - - - -	21 Mar. "	
	William Henry Hay - - -	Doctor of Medicine -	13 Feb. 1867.	Non-acting.
	James Templeman - - - -	Gentleman - - - - -	13 Feb. "	
	Elias Cox - - - - -	Shipbuilder - - - -	- July 1872	
	Herbert Eustace Hounsell -	Merchant - - - - -	- July "	
	William Townley Whetham -	- ditto - - - - -	- April 1875.	
Brighton - - -	William Alger - - - - -	Woollen Draper - - -	Mar. 1862.	Non-resident; left Brighton 15 or 16 years ago.
	Isaac Gray Bass - - - -	Wholesale Grocer - -	Dec. 1854 -	
	Arthur Bigge (Stipendiary Magistrate).	Barrister-at-Law - -	Mar. 1855.	
	John Leonhardt Bridgen (present Mayor).	Coach Builder - - -	April 1866.	
	Sir John Cordy Burrows -	Surgeon - - - - -	Dec. 1854.	Has not attended for upwards of a year. Ill; has not attended.
	Arthur Hawker Cox - - -	Chemist - - - - -	Jan. 1873.	
	William Furner - - - - -	County Court Judge -	Dec. 1854 -	
	Charles Smith Hannington -	Draper - - - - -	Jan. 1873 -	
	William Mellet Hollis - -	Gentleman - - - - -	Aug. 1858.	
	James Ireland - - - - -	Timber Merchant - -	Jan. 1875.	
	Thomas Hayter Johnston -	Gentleman - - - - -	Feb. 1867.	
	Henry Martin - - - - -	Saddler - - - - -	Jan. 1873.	
	Henry Moor - - - - -	Gentleman - - - - -	Feb. 1867.	
	Henry Penton - - - - -	Colonel of Volunteers -	Feb. "	
	William Dawson Savage -	Chemist - - - - -	Jan. 1873.	Has not attended for upwards of a year.
	Montague David Scott - -	Member of Parliament -	Dec. 1854 -	
	James William Silverthorne -	Gentleman - - - - -	April 1866.	
	David Smith - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	Jan. 1875.	
	George Tatham - - - - -	Surgeon - - - - -	Oct. 1869.	Has not attended for upwards of a year.
	Thomas Warner - - - - -	Gentleman - - - - -	Dec. 1854 -	
	Richard Mallam Webb - -	- ditto - - - - -	Jan. 1875.	
Bristol, City - - -	Christopher James Thomas (Mayor).	Soap Manufacturer - -	3 May 1854.*	Acts only for one year as late Mayor.
	Thomas Barnes (late Mayor) -	Timber Merchant - -	- - -	
	Michael Castle - - - - -	None - - - - -	26 June 1851.	Has not acted for a year and upwards.
	Robert Gay Barrow - - - -	Insurance Agent - - -	2 May 1854.	
	John Cox - - - - -	Tanner - - - - -	3 May "	
	William Naish - - - - -	None - - - - -	26 July 1856.	
	John Fisher - - - - -	None - - - - -	13 Dec. 1858.	Non-resident. Has not acted for many years.
	Sholto Vere Hare - - - -	None - - - - -	7 Feb. 1863.	
	John Hare - - - - -	None - - - - -	7 Feb. "	
	Samuel Woolcott Brown - -	None - - - - -	7 Feb. "	
	William Terrell - - - - -	Rope Manufacturer - -	7 Feb. "	Non-resident. Has not acted for many years.
	Thomas Canning - - - - -	None - - - - -	9 Feb. "	
	Elisha Smith Robinson - -	Wholesale Stationer -	16 Nov. 1864.	
	George Rock Woodward - -	Vinegar Manufacturer -	6 Sept. 1866.	
	Frederick Terrell - - - -	None - - - - -	20 Aug. "	Non-resident. Has not acted for many years.
	William Henry Harford - -	Banker - - - - -	20 Aug. "	
	William Henry Wills - - -	Tobacco Manufacturer -	20 Aug. "	
	Richard Fudge - - - - -	Colonial Broker - - -	20 Aug. "	
	John Perry - - - - -	None - - - - -	20 Aug. "	Non-resident. Has not acted for many years.
	Francis Adams - - - - -	Sugar Refiner - - - -	31 Jan. 1868.	
	George Miller - - - - -	Merchant - - - - -	30 Jan. "	
	Herbert Thomas - - - - -	Soap Manufacturer - -	30 Jan. "	
	Thomas Proctor - - - - -	Merchant - - - - -	30 Jan. "	
	James Godwin - - - - -	Iron Merchant - - - -	30 Jan. "	Non-resident. Has not acted for many years.
	Henry James Mills - - - -	None - - - - -	15 Aug. 1871.	
	Christopher Godwin - - - -	None - - - - -	22 Aug. "	
	George Wills - - - - -	None - - - - -	15 Aug. "	
	William Pethick - - - - -	Merchant - - - - -	15 Aug. "	Non-resident. Has not acted for many years.
	Charles Nash - - - - -	Timber Merchant - - -	15 Aug. "	
	William K. Wait, M.P. - - -	Corn Merchant - - - -	18 Oct. "	

* The dates given are those when the magistrates qualified. The successive additions to the Commission of the Peace are not dated. From age and infirmity some of the magistrates are not capable of active duty.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Bristol, City— <i>cont^d</i> .	William Proctor Baker - - -	Corn Merchant - - -	15 Feb. 1875.	
	William Fuidge - - -	None - - -	15 Feb. "	
	William Hathway - - -	Wholesale Woollen Merchant - - -	15 Feb. "	
	William A. F. Powell - - -	Glass Bottle Manufacturer - - -	15 Feb. "	
	Algernon William Warren - - -	Wholesale Druggist - - -	15 Feb. "	
	Mark Whitwill - - -	Merchant - - -	15 Feb. "	
Buckingham	Edward Parrott - - -	Banker - - -	6 July 1852.	
	His Grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos.	- - -	31 July 1872.	
	Sir Harry Verney, Bart. - - -	- - -	31 July "	
	James Harrison - - -	Auctioneer - - -	31 July "	
	William Harry French - - -	Ironmonger - - -	31 July "	
	Henry Thorpe - - -	Coal Merchant - - -	23 Jan. 1874.	
	*George Bennett (Mayor) - - -	Auctioneer - - -	9 Nov. "	
Burnley	Francis Humfrey (ex-Mayor) - - -	Wine Merchant - - -	9 Nov. 1873.	
	John Massey (Mayor) - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	9 Nov. 1873.	
	John Hargreaves Scott - - -	Gentleman - - -	31 Mar. 1872.	
	Adam Dugdale - - -	- ditto - - -	31 Mar. "	
	George Eastwood - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	31 Mar. "	
	William Roberts - - -	- ditto - - -	31 Mar. "	
	William Thompson - - -	Cotton Manufacturer - - -	31 Mar. "	
	John Howorth - - -	Gentleman - - -	31 Mar. "	
	William M. Coultate - - -	Surgeon - - -	3 July 1873.	
	William Lomas - - -	Gentleman - - -	3 July "	
	James Folds - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	3 July "	
	John Barnes - - -	- ditto - - -	3 July "	
	Hiram Uttley - - -	Gentleman - - -	23 Feb. 1874.	
	John Kay - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	23 Feb. "	
	Robert Handsley - - -	Gentleman - - -	24 Aug. "	
	John Greenwood - - -	Corn Miller - - -	24 Aug. "	
	John Butterworth - - -	- ditto - - -	24 Aug. "	
	George Sutcliffe - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	24 Aug. "	
Bury St. Edmunds	Sir Charles James Fox Bunbury	Baronet - - -	15 Nov. 1837	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Henry Le Grice - - -	Attorney-at-Law - - -	15 Nov. "	
	Henry James Oakes - - -	- - -	15 Nov. "	
	James Henry Porteus Oakes - - -	- - -	15 Nov. "	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Charles Beard - - -	Esquire - - -	15 Nov. 1863.	
	William Henry Rushbrooke, R.N. - - -	- ditto - - -	15 Nov. "	
	George Pearson Clay - - -	Gentleman - - -	15 Nov. "	
	George Harvey Nunn - - -	Esquire - - -	15 Nov. "	
	George Thompson (Mayor) - - -	- ditto - - -	- - -	
Cambridge	Charles Denton Leech (ex-Mayor).	- ditto - - -	- - -	These two gentlemen are <i>ex-officio</i> Justices for the year.
	John Thomas Abdy - - -	Doctor of Laws - - -	Oct. 1856 -	Left Cambridge.
	Dennis Adams - - -	Surgeon - - -	Sept. 1866.	
	Charles Balls - - -	Gentleman - - -	Feb. 1852.	
	Charles Edward Brown - - -	- ditto - - -	May 1848.	
	Moses Browne - - -	- ditto - - -	Sept. 1866.	
	James Cartmell, D.D. - - -	Master of Christ College, Cambridge.	Oct. 1852 -	
	Henry Wilkinson Cookson, D.D.	Master of Peterhouse College, Cambridge.	Oct. " -	Attend when required by the University.
	Rowland Morris Fawcett - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	Nov. 1837.	
	George Edward Foster - - -	Banker - - -	Aug. 1871 -	Attends occasionally.
	Thomas Charles Geldart - - -	Doctor of Laws - - -	Oct. 1852 -	Too old to attend.
	Swann Hurrell - - -	Gentleman - - -	Feb. " -	Left Cambridge.
	Charles Lestourgeon - - -	Surgeon - - -	Sept. 1866.	
	George Downing Liveing - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	Aug. 1871.	
	Edmund John Mortlock - - -	Banker - - -	Sept. 1866 -	Not attended for upwards of a year.
	Richard John Oakes, D.D. - - -	Provost of King's College, Cambridge.	Sept. " -	
	Robert Phelps, D.D. - - -	Master of Sidney College, Cambridge.	May 1848.	
	Robert Sayle - - -	Draper - - -	Aug. 1871 -	Not attended for upwards of a year.
	Elliot Smith - - -	Gentleman - - -	Feb. 1852.	Left Cambridge.
	William Warren - - -	Grocer - - -	Feb. " -	
	Joseph Wentworth - - -	Gentleman - - -	Feb. " -	

* The Mayor of the borough for the time being is a magistrate, and continues to act as a magistrate for 12 months after his term of office has expired.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Canterbury	John William Zorapora Wright (Mayor).	Esquire	9 Nov. 1874.	Not acted for upwards a year.
	Thomas Cooper	ditto	17 Feb. 1836	
	William Brock	ditto	11 Jan. 1852.	
	Thomas Sankey Cooper	ditto	11 Jan. 1858.	
	Harry George Austin	Architect	11 Jan. "	
	Peter Marten	Farmer	11 Jan. 1860.	
	John Aris	Stamp Distributor	3 May 1866.	
	Charles Collard	Farmer	3 May "	
	John George Drury	Esquire	3 May "	
	John Hemery	Bank Manager	3 May "	
	Alfred Neme	Soap Boiler	3 May 1868.	
	Robert Young Fill	Esquire	3 May "	
	Henry Cooper	Surveyor	3 May "	
	William Croasdill Philpott	Corn Factor	3 May "	
	George Harrison (ex-Mayor)	Tobacconist	Magistrate for one year by virtue of his having filled the office of mayor for the year ended 9th Nov. 1874.	
Cardiff	William Thomas Edwards	Doctor of Medicine	1856.	Not acting.
	William Dove Bushell	Railway Director	1856.	
	Thomas Edward Heath	Coal Merchant	1856	
	James Harvey Insole	ditto	1856	
	Griffith Phillips	Gentleman	1856.	
	William Bradley Watkins	Bank Manager	1856.	Not acting.
	George Bird	Outfitter	1856.	
	James Pride	Gentleman	1862.	
	Charles Williams David	Colliery Proprietor	1862.	
	William Alexander	Timber Merchant	1863.	
	George Johnson	Captain, Royal Navy	1867	Not acting.
	Edward Stock Hill	Ship Builder	1867.	
	Alexander Bassett	Mineral Engineer	1867.	
	Henry Imes Evans	Banker	1867	
	Henry James Paine	Doctor of Medicine	1867.	
	John Cory	Coal Merchant	1873.	Removed.
	William Vachell	Gentleman	1873	
	Thomas Evans	Surgeon	1873.	
	Daniel Jones	Contractor	1873.	
	Richard Lewis Reece	Solicitor	1873	
Cardigan	Richard David Jenkins	Solicitor	4 Dec. 1852	Resident and acting.
	Thomas Davies	Merchant	4 Dec. "	
	Thomas Edwards	ditto	4 Dec. "	
	Thomas Harris	Esquire	1872	Resident within three miles, and acting.
	John Thomas	Esquire, Surgeon	1872	
	John James Jones	Gentleman	1872	Resident and acting.
	James Levi (ex-Mayor)	Ironmonger	- Nov. 1873	
	Asa Johnes Evans (Mayor)	Solicitor	- Nov. 1874	
Carlisle	John Hargraves (Mayor)	Managing Director of the Carlisle Horse Clothing Company.	9 Nov. 1874.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Thomas Clarke (ex-Mayor)	Currier	9 Nov. 1873.	
	John Fawcett	Barrister-at-Law	20 Dec. 1837	
	John Slater	Retired Cotton Manufacturer.	20 Dec. "	Non-resident.
	Thomas Nelson	Railway, &c. Contractor	10 July 1852	
	George Head Head	Banker	10 July "	
	Thomas Nanson	Retired Hatter	4 April 1859.	Non-acting.
	William Bousfield Page	Surgeon	4 April "	
	Robert Elliot, M.D.	Medical Practitioner	15 April 1861.	
	Isaac James	Iron Merchant	15 April "	Non-acting; are county justices.
	Robert Ferguson, M.P.	Cotton Manufacturer	15 April "	
	Peter James Dixon	Retired Cotton Manufacturer.	15 April "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Carmarthen	The Mayor of Carmarthen	-	1874.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Thomas Charles Morris	Esquire	1837	
	William Morris	ditto	1847	
	John Hughes	Surgeon	1858.	Non-resident.
	Joseph Timmins	Gentleman	1858	
	John Lewis Philipps	Esquire	1861.	
	James Rowlands	Surgeon	1861.	Non-resident now, but intends returning.
	John Thomas	Esquire	1865.	
	William de Grouchy Warren	Wholesale Druggist	1865.	
	Thomas Lewis	Doctor of Medicine	1865	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Grismend Philipps	Esquire	1858	
	James Bagnall	Merchant	1865.	
	Edward Bowen Jones	Druggist	1865.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Griffith G. Philipps	Esquire	1865.	
	D. J. Browne Edwardes	-	1858	
	The ex-Mayor	-	1873.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
Carnarvon	Lewis Lewis	Draper	Elected Mayor, 9 Nov. 1874	Resident.
	James Rees	High Bailiff, County Court	Elected Mayor, 9 Nov. 1872 and 9 Nov. 1873.	
	Watkin William Roberts	Surgeon	16 Dec. 1867	
	Jeffreys Parry de Winton	Iron Founder	4 Feb. 1868	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	John Owen	Timber Merchant	10 Feb. "	
	Sir Llewelyn Turner	Attorney	21 Aug. 1871	
	Griffith Roberts Rees	Baker	3 July 1873	Resident.
	Hugh Pugh	ditto	4 July "	
	Thomas Henry Evans	Wine Merchant	21 April 1838	
Chester, City	His Grace the Duke of Westminster.	Knight of the Garter, &c., &c., &c.	17 May 1852.	Non-resident and non-acting.
	Thomas Dixon	Banker	28 Mar. 1886.	
	Edward Francis French	Retired Army Major	1846.	
	John Williams	Esquire	17 May 1852	Non-resident for several years.
	Philip Stapleton Humberston	ditto	17 May "	
	Arthur Potts	ditto	- Jan. 1863.	
	Meadows Frost	Merchant	- Jan. "	Non-resident for several years.
	William Maysmor Williams	ditto	7 Jan. 1867.	
	Robert Frost	ditto	7 Jan. "	
	John Harrison	Surgeon	7 Jan. "	Non-resident for several years.
	Thomas Davies Colley	Physician	19 Aug. 1868.	
	William Johnson	Merchant	9 Jan. 1869.	
	Sir Thomas Gibbons Frost	Knight	20 Oct. "	Non-resident for several years.
	Francis Arthur Dickson	Merchant	6 Jan. 1871.	
	William M'Ewen	Physician	11 April 1872.	
	Albert Wood	Iron Founder	11 April "	Non-resident for several years.
	Joseph Oakes	Silk Mercer	11 April "	
	Enoch Robert Gibbon Salisbury	Barrister-at-Law	11 April "	
	Thomas Finchett Maddock	Esquire	3 Feb. 1873.	Non-resident for several years.
	Thomas Quellyn Roberts (Mayor).	Wine Merchant	Elected Mayor, 9 Nov. 1874.	
Chesterfield	George Albert Rooth (Mayor, <i>ex officio</i>).	Timber Merchant	9 Nov. 1874.	Non-resident for several years.
	Thomas Philpot Wood (ex-Mayor, <i>ex officio</i>).	Wine and Spirit Merchant	10 Nov. 1873.	
	Cornelius Black	Doctor of Medicine	21 Dec. 1869.	
	Charles Booth	- ditto	21 Dec. "	Non-resident for several years.
	John Mark Hewitt	Candle Wick Manufacturer	21 Dec. "	
	Simeon Manlove	Esquire	21 Dec. "	
	John Stores Smith	Coal and Iron Master	21 Dec. "	Non-resident for several years.
Chichester, City	Edward Habin	Saddler	- April 1875	All resident in the city and acting.
	Joseph M'Carogher	Physician	1837	
	Nicholas Qyacke	- ditto	1837	
	George Irving	Gentleman	1837	All resident in the city and acting.
	Thomas Smith	- ditto	- April 1863	
	Frederic Jolin Freeland	Surgeon	- Feb. 1868	
	Henry Allen	Silk Mercer	- Jan. 1874	All resident in the city and acting.
	Francis Valentine Paxton	Physician	- Jan. "	
	Charles Townsend Halsted	Banker	- Jan. "	
	John Caffin	Merchant	1875	All resident in the city and acting.
	J. J. Johnson, q.c.	Recorder	1864	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.		
	Name.	Profession.				
Chepping Wycombe *	William Rose - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	Aug. 1851.	Non-resident within the borough.		
	Randolph Crewe - - - -	Esquire - - - -	Aug. " -			
	Charles Thomas Grove - - - -	Major - - - -	April 1858.	Non-resident.		
	Alfred Gilbey - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	March 1875 -			
	Arthur Vernon - - - -	Architect - - - -	March " -			
	Henry Stephens Wheeler - - - -	Paper Manufacturer - - - -	March " -			
Clifton, Dartmouth, Hardness.	John Morgan Puddicombe (Mayor).	Surgeon - - - -	9 Nov. 1874	Non-resident. Of 3, Eaton-square, London; occasionally at Kingswear Castle, near Dartmouth, but non-acting.		
	The mayor of the next preceding year; none at present, Mr. Puddicombe having been elected two years in succession.					
	Sir Henry Paul Seale (Bart.)	No profession - - - -	1836.			
	John Bulley - - - -	Ship Owner - - - -	1850 - - -			
	Charles Seale Hayne - - - -	Barrister-at-Law - - - -	1860 - - -			
	Richard Brown Cleland - - - -	Formerly a Ship Master - - - -	1860.			
	Augustus Newman - - - -	Surgeon, M. B. - - - -	1867 - - -			
	Edward Marsh Turnor - - - -	Steamship Agent - - - -	1867.			
	William Ashford - - - -	Merchant - - - -	1867.			
	Hunter Gaskell - - - -	No profession - - - -	1869.			
	Mark Fox - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1871.			
	Alexander Bridgway (Lieut. Col., 2nd Ad. B., D. A. V.).	Army Agent - - - -	1871.			
	Clitheroe - - - -	James Bleakley - - - -	Gentleman - - - -		20 June 1873	Resident and acting
		Richard Briggs - - - -	Lime and Stone Merchant - - - -		20 June " -	
		Thomas Bulcock - - - -	Gentleman - - - -		20 June " -	
Robert Dewhurst - - - -		Cotton Spinner and Manufacturer. - - - -	20 June " -			
George Foster - - - -		Gentleman - - - -	20 June " -			
William Garnett - - - -		Cotton Spinner and Manufacturer. - - - -	20 June " -			
James Garnett - - - -		- ditto - - - -	20 June " -			
John Mitchell - - - -		Paper Manufacturer - - - -	20 June " -			
Thomas Byrmand Trappes - - - -		Gentleman - - - -	20 June " -			
Charles James Byrmand Trappes - - - -		- ditto - - - -	20 June " -			
Robert Brown - - - -		Cotton Manufacturer - - - -	- June 1874			
William Bolton Dewhurst - - - -		Silversmith and Farmer - - - -	- June " -			
Thomas Whittaker - - - -		Iron and Brass Founder - - - -	- June " -			
Colchester - - - -		John William Egerton Green	Banker - - - -	1837 - - -	Non-acting for several years past; a great invalid.	
		Robert Maitland Saville - - - -	Malt Distiller - - - -	1842 - - -		
	George Henry Errington - - - -	Banker - - - -	1844 - - -	Non-resident many years. Acts only occasionally.		
	Edward Williams - - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - - -	1851.			
	John Mann, the younger - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1851 - - -			
	John Fitzsimmons Bishop - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1858.	Non-resident many years.		
	James Ashwell Tabor - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1858.			
	Joseph Savill - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1858.			
	Peter Martin Duncan - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1858 - - -	Non-resident many years.		
	Thomas Catchpool - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1864.			
	William Waylen - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1864.			
	Philip Oxenden Papillon - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1867.	Non-acting; never qualified.		
	Charles Henry Hawkins - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1867.			
	Roger Sturley Nunn - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1867 - - -			
	Hector John Gardon Rebow - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1871 - - -	Non-resident, will return in a year or two.		
	John Bawtree Harvey - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1871.			
	Edward Augustus Round - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1875.			
	Horace George Egerton Green - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1875.			
	Tyssen Sowley Holroyd - - - -	Captain - - - -	1875.			

* Three only on 1st March 1875; three have qualified since.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Congleton - - -	James Pearson* - - -	Silk Manufacturer - - -	May 1852 -	Non-acting for more than a year.
	John Dakin - - -	Tea Merchant - - -	July 1857 -	
	Edward Harrison Solly* - - -	Silk Spinner - - -	July " -	Acting.
	John Fielder Hall - - -	- ditto - - -	May 1863 -	
	Robert Beales* - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	May " -	Non-resident and non-acting for four years.
	James Holdforth - - -	Silk Spinner - - -	May " -	
	Benjamin Radley - - -	Wine Merchant - - -	July 1868 -	Acting.
	Isaac Sutton - - -	Esquire - - -	July " -	Non-resident and non-acting for three years.
	Capel Wilson Hogg* - - -	Silk Merchant - - -	July " -	
	Dennis Bradwell - - -	- ditto - - -	July " -	Acting.
	John Hill - - -	Land Steward - - -	Oct. 1870 -	
	Francis William Warrington -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	Oct. " -	Very rarely acting, but resident.
Coventry - - -	R. A. Dalton, Esq. (Mayor); Henry Loden, Esq. (ex-Mayor), for one year after expiration of term of office.			
	George Startin - - -	Esquire - - -	15 Nov. 1837	Non-acting.
	Thomas Schuman Morris -	- ditto - - -	15 Nov. "	Resident, but non-acting.
	Abraham Burbery Herbert -	- ditto - - -	- Dec. 1852	
	William Odell - - -	- ditto - - -	- Dec. "	Resides in Scotland.
	Abijah Hill Pears - - -	- ditto - - -	- Dec. "	
	Samuel Vale - - -	- ditto - - -	- Dec. "	
	Edward Dewes - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	15 June 1866	
	James Marriott - - -	Builder and Contractor -	15 June "	
	John Gulson - - -	Esquire - - -	15 June "	
	Henry Loden - - -	- ditto - - -	15 June "	
	William Lynes - - -	- ditto - - -	29 Nov. "	
	Francis Wyley - - -	Wholesale Drug Manufac- turer.	29 Nov. "	
	Joseph Odell - - -	Elastic Webb Manufac- turer.	29 Nov. "	
	William Henry Hill - - -	Gentleman - - -	9 Oct. 1873	Resident and acting.
	Thomas Berry - - -	- ditto - - -	9 Oct. "	
	Edward Petre - - -	Esquire - - -	9 Oct. "	
	Richard Caldicott - - -	- ditto - - -	9 Oct. "	
	Thomas Jenkins - - -	Chemist - - -	9 Oct. "	
	William Carter - - -	Ribbon Manufacturer -	9 Oct. "	
	Robert Arnold Dalton - -	- ditto - - -	9 Oct. "	
	John Rotherham, the younger	Watch Manufacturer -	9 Oct. "	
	Edward Lynes - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	9 Oct. "	
Darlington - - -	John Hardcastle Bowman -	Leather Merchant - - -	1869 - -	
	Charles Janson - - -	Ironmaster - - -	1869 - -	
	Edward Kipling - - -	Gentleman - - -	1869 - -	
	Henry Pease - - -	Esquire - - -	1869 - -	
	Alfred Kitching - - -	Ironmaster - - -	1872 - -	
	Robert Teasdale - - -	Leather Merchant - - -	1872 - -	
	Henry Fell Pease (Mayor) -	Merchant - - -	Elected 9 Nov. 1874.	
	Arthur Pease (ex-Mayor) -	- ditto - - -	Elected 9 Nov. 1873.	
Deal - - -	George Hughes - - -	Gentleman - - -	5 April 1850	Non-acting.
	John Iggulden - - -	- ditto - - -	25 June 1858	
	John Gaunt - - -	- ditto - - -	15 Oct. 1858	
	Edmund Brown - - -	- ditto - - -	6 July 1860	
	William Matson Cavell - -	- ditto - - -	5 Jan. 1866	
	Frederick Thomas Hulke -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	5 Jan. 1872	
	George Fry - - -	Gentleman - - -	5 Jan. 1872	Non-resident.
	George Hammond - - -	Died, 19 February 1875.		

* Those thus marked (*) are also county magistrates.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Denbigh - - - -	A. E. Turnour - - - -	Doctor of Medicine - -	7 Nov. 1853	Resident and acting.
	Evan Pierce - - - -	- ditto - - - -	28 June 1856	
	Richard Lloyd Williams -	Architect and County Surveyor.	6 Feb. 1863	
	John Williams Lloyd - - -	Gentleman Farmer - -	1 Mar. 1870	
	Thomas Evans - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1 Mar. "	
	J. Parry Jones - - - -	Solicitor - - - -	Mayor from 9 Nov. 1857 to 9 Nov. 1859, and elected Mayor on 9 Nov. 1873 and 9 Nov. 1874.	
Derby - - - -	John Bailey - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1867 - - -	None of the Justices are non-resident; they all reside within seven miles, or occupy places of business in the borough.
	William Thomas Cox - - -	Lead Merchant - - -	1862.	
	Samuel Walker Cox - - -	Merchant - - - -	1866.	
	William Thomas Edwards Cox	- ditto - - - -	1868.	
	John Gilbert Crompton - -	Banker - - - -	1860.	
	Henry Darby - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1863.	
	Thomas William Evans - -	Member of Parliament -	1853.	
	Thomas Boden Forman - -	Hop Merchant - - -	1862.	
	Henry Francis Gisborne - -	Surgeon - - - -	1853.	
	George Gascoyne - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1866 - - -	
	Frederick Longdon - - - -	Merchant - - - -	1868.	Non-acting for upwards of a year owing to pressing engagements, but hopes soon to resume his magisterial duties.
	Charles Edmund Newton - -	Banker - - - -	1866.	
	Thomas Roe, Sen. - - - -	Timber Merchant - - -	1868.	
	Rowland Smith - - - -	Banker - - - -	1866 - - -	
	George Taylor - - - -	Doctor of Physic - - -	1868.	
	Sir Henry Wilmot - - - -	Baronet - - - -	1866.	
	John Smith - - - -	Brass Founder - - -	1874.	
	Walter Boden - - - -	Manufacturer - - -	1874.	
	John Jobson - - - -	Iron Founder - - -	1874.	
Devizes - - - -	Thomas Chandler, Jun. - -	Maltster - - - -	Mayor.	Non-resident for several years.
	Stephen Reynolds - - - -	Currier - - - -	Ex-Mayor.	
	William Edmund Tugwell - -	Gentleman - - - -	1852.	
	George Waylen - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	1852.	
	Henry Butcher - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1852.	
	Thomas James Heard - - -	- ditto - - - -	1852.	
	Jacob Player - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1852 - - -	
	Alexander Meek - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1872.	
	William Brown - - - -	Iron Founder - - -	1872.	
	Thomas Barker Fox - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1872.	
	Richard William Biggs - -	- ditto - - - -	1872.	
	Edward Benjamin Anstie - -	Tobacco and Snuff Manufacturer.	1872.	
Devonport - - - -	Timothy Carew - - - -	Lieutenant, R.N. - - -	8 April 1842	Non-resident and non-acting.
	Josiah Glencross - - - -	Esquire - - - -	7 May 1851	
	Joseph May - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	29 Dec. 1859.	
	George Dansey - - - -	- ditto - - - -	29 Dec. "	
	Thomas Crossing - - - -	- ditto - - - -	29 Dec. "	
	Richard John Laity - - -	- ditto - - - -	29 Dec. "	
	James Bowen Somerville - -	Commander, R.N. - - -	29 Dec. "	
	John William Walters Ryder -	Esquire - - - -	12 Nov. 1861.	
	John Lane Cutcliffe - - -	Surgeon - - - -	12 Nov. "	
	Alfred Norman - - - -	Architect - - - -	12 Nov. "	
	Frederick Row - - - -	Doctor of Physic - - -	3 July 1867.	
	Paul William Swain - - -	Surgeon - - - -	3 July "	
	Charles Row - - - -	Chemist - - - -	3 July "	
	George Stephens Brown - -	Lieutenant Colonel - -	30 Oct. "	
	William Oliver - - - -	Navy Agent - - - -	3 July "	
	Edward St. Aubyn - - - -	Esquire - - - -	26 Sept. "	
	Richard Clarkson Smith - -	- ditto - - - -	17 Oct. 1873.	
	William Peek - - - -	- ditto - - - -	17 Oct. "	
	John Rolston - - - -	Doctor of Physic - - -	17 Oct. "	
	James Joll - - - -	Esquire - - - -	17 Oct. "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Dewsbury	William Henry Thornton	Surgeon	30 Sept. 1868.	Yes. Both non-resident and non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Joseph Tweedale Rawsthorne	Lime and Stone Merchant	30 Sept. "	
	Charles Robert Scholes, Sen.	Gentleman	30 Sept. "	
	Thomas Greenwood	Tanner	30 Sept. "	
	Matthew Ridgway	Draper	30 Sept. "	
	Robert Illingworth Critchley	Card Maker	30 Sept. "	
	William Blakeley	Woollen Manufacturer	26 July 1869.	
	John Rhodes	ditto	19 Nov. 1874.	
	Mark Oldroyd, Jun.	ditto	19 Nov. "	
	Henry Day	ditto	19 Nov. "	
	Lewis Alexander Shepherd	Gentleman	19 Nov. "	
	Mark Newsome	Blanket Manufacturer	19 Nov. "	
	Joseph Day	Woollen Manufacturer	19 Nov. "	
	Frederick Firth (Mayor)	Builder	9 Nov. "	Not on the commission.
Doncaster	John Clack (Mayor), Justice of the Peace for the time being.	Tanner.		
	Charles Jackson	Gentleman	17 Feb. 1836.	
	Sir Isaac Morley	Knight	23 May 1848.	
	William Dunhill	Chemist	May 1857.	
	George Dunn	Physician	May "	
	William Sheardown	Gentleman	May "	
	Richard Ecroyd Clark	Grocer	22 June 1868.	
	Charles Edward Stephen Cooke	Banker	22 June "	
	Richard Morris	Merchant	22 June "	
	Charles Stockil	Tanner	22 June "	
	William Cotterill Clark	Grocer	2 Oct. 1874.	
	Robert Stockil	Bank Manager	2 Oct. "	
	John Sykes	Physician	2 Oct. "	
Dorchester	William Lewis Henning	Esquire	15 Aug. 1842	Non-resident.
	Herbert Williams	ditto	15 Aug. "	Non-acting.
	William Denning Tapp	Surgeon	29 Jan. 1856	Non-resident.
	George Currie	ditto	29 Jan. "	
	Edward Pearce	Banker	29 Jan. "	Non-acting.
	John Galpin	Iron Founder	29 Jan. "	
	John Francis Hodges	Esquire	25 Feb. "	
	Matthew Devenish	ditto	25 Feb. "	
	Robert Davis	ditto	21 Mar. 1859.	
	John Ensor	ditto	21 Mar. "	Dead.
	John Pelly Aldridge	ditto	7 May 1866.	
	George John Gregory Gregory	Gentleman	9 Nov. 1874.	
Dover	The Mayor for the time being.			
	William Rastall Dickenson	Gentleman	1837	Non-resident.
	Samuel Metcalfe Latham	Consul	1837.	
	William Philpott Elsted	Gentleman	1837	Non-acting.
	Charles Barns Wilkins	Esquire	Not known, 21 Dec. 1841	Non-resident.
	Edward Ferrand Astley	Doctor of Medicine	1857.	
	Steriker Finnis	Timber Merchant	1857.	
	Richard Dickeson	Provision Merchant	1863.	
	William Rutley Mowll	Coal Merchant	1863.	
	Thomas Erridge Back	Draper	1863.	
	John George Smith	Customs Agent	1863.	
	Charles Stein	Bank Manager	1863.	
	James Cuthbert Ottaway	Esquire	1867	Non-resident.
	John Farrar Crookes	ditto	1867	ditto.
	Joseph George Churchward	ditto	1867.	
	Rowland Rees	Surveyor	1870.	
	Robert Hesketh Jones	Coal Merchant and Gas Contractor.	1874.	
	Rev. John Topham	Clerk in Holy Orders	1836.	
	John Tolley	Gentleman	1836	Non-acting for upwards of a year from old age.
	Thomas Grove Smith	ditto	1848	Non-resident, but acting.
	John Henry Bradley	ditto	1860.	
	Edward Penrice	ditto	1860	Non-acting for upwards of a year from infirmity.
	Serjeant Samuel Roden	Doctor of Medicine	1860.	
	Joseph Ashby Fardon	Gentleman	1873.	
	John Bradley	ditto	1873.	
	Richard Westall	ditto	1873	Non-resident, but acting.
	William Nutt	ditto	1874.	
Droitwich	Rev. John Topham	Clerk in Holy Orders	1836.	
	John Tolley	Gentleman	1836	Non-acting for upwards of a year from old age.
	Thomas Grove Smith	ditto	1848	Non-resident, but acting.
	John Henry Bradley	ditto	1860.	
	Edward Penrice	ditto	1860	Non-acting for upwards of a year from infirmity.
	Serjeant Samuel Roden	Doctor of Medicine	1860.	
	Joseph Ashby Fardon	Gentleman	1873.	
	John Bradley	ditto	1873.	
	Richard Westall	ditto	1873	Non-resident, but acting.
	William Nutt	ditto	1874.	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Dudley	Mayor and Ex-mayor - - -	Varies - - - -	Nov. each year.	Non-acting for upwards of a year. Non-acting and non-resident. Non-resident, but occupies within the borough, and acts. Resident and acts. Non-resident and non-acting. Occupies and acts. Non-resident and non-acting. Resident and acts. Non-resident and non-acting. Occupies and acts. Resident and acts. Occupies and acts. Resident and acts. Resident and acts.
	Thomas William Fletcher - -	Gentleman - - - -	Mar. 1867 -	
	Frederick Smith Shenstone - -	ditto - - - -	Mar. " -	
	Charles Cochrane - - -	Iron Master, &c. - - -	Mar. " -	
	John Aston - - -	Coal Master - - - -	Mar. " -	
	George Bagott - - -	Druggist - - - -	Mar. " -	
	Job Taylor - - -	Gentleman - - - -	Mar. " -	
	William Wilkinson - - -	Vice and Anvil Manu- facturer. - - - -	Mar. " -	
	Henry Green - - -	Gentleman - - - -	Mar. " -	
	John Fisher - - -	Iron Merchant - - - -	Mar. " -	
	Henry Smith - - -	Iron Manufacturer - - -	Mar. " -	
	Edward Grainger - - -	Gentleman - - - -	Mar. " -	
	John Round Tilley - - -	Tanner - - - -	Mar. " -	
	Samuel Rudge - - -	Saddler - - - -	Mar. " -	
	Samuel Price - - -	Tanner - - - -	Mar. " -	
	George Thompson - - -	Corn Merchant, &c. - - -	Nov. 1873 -	
	Owen Wright - - -	Vice and Anvil Manu- facturer. - - - -	Nov. " -	
Dunstable	John Henry Limbrey (Mayor) - -	Ironmonger - - - -	9 Nov. 1874 (For one year.)	Resident and acting.
	Richard Howes - - -	Farmer - - - -	7 Mar. 1866	Non-resident, but occupying land in borough, and acting when required.
	Joseph Gutteridge - - -	Esquire - - - -	7 Mar. "	Resident and acting.
	John Cooper - - -	Straw Manufacturer - - -	7 Mar. "	Non-resident and non-acting.
	Edward Lockhart - - -	Esquire - - - -	7 Mar. "	Resident and acting.
	Theodore Harris - - -	Banker - - - -	1874 -	Non-resident, but superintending branch bank in borough, and acting.
	Charles Cyril Hicks, M.D. - -	Surgeon - - - -	1874 -	Resident and acting.
	Charles Lockhart - - -	Esquire - - - -	1874 -	
Durham	George Gradon - - -	Mayor - - - -	2 Aug. 1873.	Non-resident and non-acting. Non-acting for a year.
	John Bramwell - - -	Recorder - - - -	- May 1860.	
	Randal Stevenson - - -	Ex-mayor - - - -	10 Nov. 1873.	
	Henry Stapylton - - -	Esquire - - - -	- Feb. 1847	
	William Henderson - - -	ditto - - - -	- Feb. "	
	John Shields - - -	ditto - - - -	- Feb. "	
	William Boyd - - -	ditto - - - -	- May 1860.	
	Robert Robson - - -	ditto - - - -	- May "	
	Samuel Rowlandson - - -	ditto - - - -	- May "	
	Thomas White - - -	ditto - - - -	9 Nov. 1871.	
	James Fowler - - -	ditto - - - -	9 Nov. 1872.	
	James Monks - - -	ditto - - - -	2 Aug. 1873.	
	Thomas Scanin - - -	ditto - - - -	2 Aug. "	
	John Brewster Chapman - - -	ditto - - - -	2 Aug. "	
	Christopher Rowlandson - - -	ditto - - - -	2 Aug. "	
	Thomas Bagley - - -	ditto - - - -	2 Aug. "	
	Edward Peele - - -	ditto - - - -	30 Jan. 1875.	
	Richard Hodges - - -	ditto - - - -	30 Jan. "	
	Arthur Beanlands - - -	ditto - - - -	30 Jan. "	
East Retford	William Wilkinson - - -	Gentleman - - - -	10 Dec. 1859.	Resident and acting. Non-resident, but acting.
	Thomas Cottam - - -	Draper - - - -	- May 1873	
	Francis White - - -	Merchant - - - -	- May "	
	John Smith - - -	Farmer - - - -	- May "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Evesham - - -	Oswald, New - - -	Surgeon - - -	1868.	<div>Has not acted for upwards of two years on account of ill health.</div> <div>Has not acted for many years.</div> <div>Has not acted for upwards of a year.</div>
	Anthony Martin - - -	- ditto - - -	1866 - - -	
	Thomas White - - -	Tanner - - -	1855 - - -	
	Edward Charles Rudge - - -	Esquire - - -	1858 - - -	
	Benjamin Workman - - -	- ditto - - -	1856 - - -	
	Henry Workman - - -	- ditto - - -	1852.	
	Alfred Huband - - -	Gentleman - - -	1866.	
	William Thomas Allard - - -	Maltster - - -	1868.	
	Allen Lankester Haynes - - -	Surgeon - - -	1873.	
	John Loxley - - -	Gentleman - - -	1873.	
	Henry William Smith - - -	Auctioneer - - -	1873.	
	John Colston - - -	Gentleman - - -	1873.	
	Abraham Harding Wright - - -	Hop Merchant - - -	1873.	
Borough and County of the City of Exeter.	The Mayor of Exeter - - -	- - -	- - -	Resident and acting.
	Samuel Budd - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	- Nov. 1855	Resident; non-acting.
	Augustus Drake - - -	- ditto - - -	- - -	
	Daniel Bishop Davy - - -	Esquire - - -	- Nov. 1840	Dead.
	Thomas Latimer - - -	Newspaper Proprietor, now out of business.	- Feb. 1851	Resident; non-acting.
	Charles Henry Turner - - -	Solicitor, not in practice; District Registrar of the Probate Court.	21 Oct. 1852	Not - resident; non-acting.
	William Kendall - - -	Woollen Draper, now out of business.	- Feb. 1859	Resident; acting.
	Mark Kennaway - - -	Esquire - - -	- Dec. 1864	Resident; non-acting.
	William Henry Glachsias - - -	Woollen Draper - - -	- Dec. "	
	Ralph Sanders, Esq. - - -	Banker - - -	- Dec. "	Auctioneer
	John Damerel - - -	Auctioneer - - -	- May 1866	
	Frederick Franklin - - -	Gentleman - - -	- May "	Confectioner, now out of business.
	William Cuthbertson - - -	Confectioner, now out of business.	17 Nov. 1868	
	William Clifford - - -	Gentleman - - -	17 Nov. "	Gentleman
	William Cann - - -	- ditto - - -	17 Nov. "	
	John Trehane - - -	- ditto - - -	26 Feb. 1872	Manure Merchant
	Henry Norrington - - -	Manure Merchant - - -	26 Feb. "	
	William Mortimer - - -	Stock and Share Broker - - -	26 Feb. "	Chemist and Druggist, now out of business.
	John Knapman - - -	Chemist and Druggist, now out of business.	26 Feb. "	
	William Davy - - -	Carrier - - -	26 Feb. "	Surveyor
	Robert Dymond - - -	Surveyor - - -	26 Feb. "	
	Richard James Norman King	Surgeon Dentist - - -	26 Feb. "	
Eye - - -	George Warner Lawton - - -	Solicitor - - -	- - -	Acting as Mayor.
	James Moore - - -	Surgeon - - -	1837 - - -	Resident and acting.
	Sir Edward Clarence Kerrison	Baronet - - -	1851 - - -	Resides about two miles from the borough; non-acting.
	Robert Bishop - - -	Chemist - - -	1851 - - -	Resident and acting.
	Walter William Miller - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	Within the last few years.	
	Charles Fisher Costerton - - -	Flax Manufacturer - - -	- ditto - - -	Resides about three miles from the borough; acting.
	Philip Henry Michell - - -	Esquire - - -	- ditto - - -	Resides on the borders of the borough; acting.
Falmouth - - -	Robert Richard Broad - - -	Retired Merchant and Ship Agent.	1852 - - -	Acting.
	Robert Milford Tweedy - - -	Banker - - -	1866 - - -	Named on commission, but has never acted, and declines to do so.
	Frederick Charles Bullmore - - -	Surgeon - - -	1860 - - -	Acting.
	Thomas Rickard Olver - - -	Builder and Surveyor - - -	1866 - - -	
	Edward Burnbury Nott - - -	Captain, R. N. - - -	1866 - - -	Non-resident for upwards of a year.
	John Tucker - - -	- ditto - - -	1866 - - -	Acting.
	Thomas Webber - - -	Flour Factor - - -	1868 - - -	
	William Henry Lean - - -	Shipbuilder - - -	1874 - - -	
	John Pascoe Bennetts - - -	Secretary, Docks Company, &c.	1874 - - -	
The Mayor for the time being is also included in the commission.				

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Faversham - -	Edward Garraway - -	Surgeon - - - -	1857.	Seldom acts.
	Charles Bryant - - -	Draper - - - -	1860.	
	William Nash Spong - -	Medical Officer of Urban Sanitary Authority.	1860 - - -	
	Hafford Fielding - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1866.	
	Richard Watson Smith -	Gunpowder Manufacturer	1873.	
	John Andrew Anderson, jun.	Cement Manufacturer -	1873.	
Flint - - -	Henry Mortlock Ommanney -	Gentleman - - - -	- - -	Resides in London, but the Lord Chancellor's secretary holds a letter in which he states that he hopes 'ere long to reside in the neighbourhood of Flint. Has not as yet qualified.
	Edward Bate - - - -	Brewer.	- - -	
	Thomas Lewis - - - -	Gentleman.	- - -	
	Richard Muspratt - - -	Alkali Manufacturer.	- - -	
	John Kingsby Huntley -	- - ditto.	- - -	
	John Henry - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1874.	
	Peter Alfred Mawdsley -	Alkali Manufacturer -	1874.	
	James Liebig Muspratt -	- - ditto - - - -	1874.	
Folkestone - - -	Thomas Bate - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1874 - - -	Non-resident (London). Non-resident (Tunbridge). Non-resident (Aldershot).
	William Bateman - - -	Surgeon - - - -	1845.	
	James Kelcey - - - -	Farmer - - - -	1854.	
	Angus Mackay Leith - -	Bank Manager - - -	1859 - - -	
	William Falkner Bowrell -	Barrister-at-Law - -	1859 - - -	
	Robert William Boarer -	Gentleman - - - -	1859.	
	Silvester Eastes - - -	Surgeon - - - -	1859.	
	James Tolputt - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1859.	
	Charles Doridant - - -	Hotel Keeper - - -	1868 - - -	
	George Blicke Champion de Crespigny.	Lieutenant Colonel in the Army.	1869.	
	John Clark - - - -	Schoolmaster - - - -	1869.	
Gateshead - - -	R. W. Hodgson - - - -	Stone Merchant - - -	1855 - - -	Non-acting for more than a year. Non-resident, and non-acting for more than a year. Non-acting for more than a year. Non-resident, and non-acting for more than a year. Never qualified, and non-acting for more than a year.
	Ralph Wake - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1855 - - -	
	B. J. Prockter - - - -	Glue Manufacturer - -	May 1861.	
	William Brown - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	May "	
	John Sowerby - - - -	Glass Manufacturer - -	May "	
	J. C. Johnson - - - -	Cement Manufacturer -	Mar. 1866 -	
	Benjamin Bigger - - -	Merchant - - - -	Mar. "	
	Edmond Crawshay - - -	Iron Manufacturer - -	Mar. "	
	Henry Milvain - - - -	Shipowner - - - -	Mar. "	
	James Leathart - - - -	Lead Manufacturer - -	May 1872.	
	William Muschamp - - -	Paper Manufacturer - -	May "	
	J. M. Redmayne - - - -	Chemical Manufacturer -	May "	
	R. S. Newall - - - -	Wire Rope Manufacturer	May "	
	William Galloway - - -	Nail Manufacturer - -	May "	
Glossop - - -	Lawrence Adamson - - -	Iron Manufacturer - - -	May "	
	Francis James Sumner - -	Cotton Manufacturer - -	16 Aug. 1867.	Non-acting for more than a year.
	William Shepley - - - -	- - ditto - - - -	16 Aug. "	
	Frederic Buckley - - -	- - ditto - - - -	16 Aug. "	
	Thomas Rhodes - - - -	- - ditto - - - -	16 Aug. "	
	John Hadfield - - - -	- - ditto - - - -	16 Aug. "	
	Joseph Stafford - - - -	- - ditto - - - -	16 Aug. "	
	William Sidebottom (ex-Mayor)	Gentleman - - - -	10 Nov. 1873.	
	Samuel Wood (Mayor) - -	Cotton Manufacturer - -	9 Nov. 1874.	
Gloucester - - -	Edward Boughton - - -	Iron Merchant - - - -	Aug. 1858 -	Non-resident for 10 years.
	A. J. Woods - - - -	Doctor of Medicine - -	July 1852 -	
	Thomas B. Washbourne - -	- - ditto - - - -	Aug. 1858.	
	William B. Clegam - - -	Gentleman - - - -	Aug. "	
	Colonel Dowling - - - -	- - ditto - - - -	Aug. 1858 -	Non-resident; declined to qualify. Non-acting.
	Edward Leader Kendall - -	Ship Broker, &c. - - -	June 1862.	
	Edmund V. Ellis - - - -	Corn Merchant - - - -	June "	
	Thomas Robinson (Mayor) -	- - ditto - - - -	May 1866.	
	Thomas Hickeys - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	May "	Non-acting through illness, of which he cannot recover.
	William Nicks - - - -	Timber Merchant - - -	June 1868.	
	George N. C. Buchanan - -	Gentleman - - - -	June "	
	Joseph Reynolds - - - -	Miller - - - -	Mar. 1871.	
	George F. Riddiford - -	Gentleman - - - -	Mar. "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Gloucester—continued.	Alfred P. Carter	Surgeon	Mar. 1871.	Declined to qualify.
	Henry Allen (ex-Mayor)	Miller	Jan. 1874.	
	John Knight	General Merchant	Jan. "	
	Charles Walker	Timber Merchant	Jan. "	
	Ryves W. Greaves	Surgeon	Jan. "	
	Thomas Marling	Gentleman	Feb. 1875.	
	Thomas N. Foster	Seed Crusher	Feb. "	
	John M. Butt	Iron Merchant	Feb. "	
	Isaac Slater	Gentleman	Feb. "	
	Henry Bruton	Auctioneer	Feb. "	
	Alfred C. Wheeler	Seed Merchant	Feb. "	
	Edward Tew Smith	Corn Merchant	Feb. "	
	Josiah Castree, jun.	Land Agent	Feb. "	
Grantham	John Fowler Burbidge	Brewer	June 1852.	Non-resident, and not having acted for over a year.
	William Eaton	Doctor of Medicine	June "	
	Thomas Bushby	Stationer	Oct. 1859.	
	James William Jeans	Surgeon	Oct. "	
	Lawrence Ridge	Stationer	Dec. 1874.	
	James Hornsby	Agricultural Implement Manufacturer.	Mar. 1869.	
	Richard John Bryall (Mayor, for the time being).	Carriage Manufacturer.		
	Lawrence Ridge (ex-Mayor, for the time being).	Stationer.		
Gravesend	*Thomas Troughton	Tallow Chandler	April 1858	Resident.
	*George Sams	None	Dec. 1869	
	*Griffith Taylor	None	Sept. 1857	Resides about six miles away
	*Dr. Armstrong	Doctor of Medicine	April 1858	
	*Charles Spencer	None	Jan. 1862	Resident.
	*Jonathan Elkin	Coal Merchant	Dec. 1869	
	*John Jeffery	None	Aug. 1872	Non-resident.
	*J. H. Hatten	None	Dec. 1869	
	*George Müller	None	Aug. 1872	Resident.
	*William Simpson	Paper Maker	Aug. "	
Great Grimsby	John Bell	Surgeon, &c.	Dec. 1841	Non-resident upwards of eight years.
	Charles Perceval Loft	Railway Clerk	Dec. "	Non-acting upwards of 10 years
	George Skelton	Retired Chemist	Dec. "	
	Hildyard Marshall Leppington	Surgeon	Mar. 1850.	Non-resident several years.
	Charles Bartholomew Moody	- ditto -	Feb. 1857.	
	John Winttingham	Timber Merchant	Feb. "	
	John Sowerby	Retired Merchant	June 1858.	
	George Holland	Surgeon	June "	
	Henry Bennett	Timber Merchant	Mar. 1863.	
	John Skelton	Retired Merchant	Mar. "	
	John Marshall	Merchant	Mar. "	
	Peter Kerslake Seddon	Timber Merchant	Feb. 1867.	
	Francis Long	- ditto -	Feb. "	
	James Lambden	Surgeon	Feb. "	
	Edward Bannister	Coal Merchant	July 1874.	
	Henry James Veal	Retired Solicitor	July "	
	Thomas Bell Keatly	Surgeon	July "	
	James Reid	Postmaster	July "	
Guildford	Thomas Jenner Sells	Surgeon	Dec. 1850.	Non-resident.
	Joseph Weale	Gentleman	Feb. 1854.	
	John Topham	- ditto -	Mar. 1861.	
	Dodsworth Haydon	Banker	May 1867.	
	Edward Thomas Upperton	Gentleman	May "	
	George Tayler	Barrister-at-Law	Feb. 1873	
	William Triggs	Jeweller	May 1874.	Non-resident.
	Gilbert John Smallpiece	Banker	May "	
	Philip Whittington Jacob	Gentleman	May "	
	John Morgan Howard (Recorder).	Barrister-at-Law	Mar. 1875	

* All have acted during the year.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Halifax	Edward Crossley (Mayor)		9 Nov. 1874.	Non-acting.
	Thomas Waymair	Woolstapler	28 April "	
	John Dyson Hutchinson	Gentleman	Nov. 1869.	
	Joshua Appleyard	Merchant	12 Nov. 1849.	
	John Crossley	Manufacturer	12 Nov. "	
	George Buckstone Browne	Gentleman	12 Nov. "	
	Samuel Waterhouse	Merchant	12 Nov. "	
	Thomas Selby Walsh	Manufacturer	Nov. 1858.	
	James Bowman	Banker	Nov. "	
	William Irving Holdsworth	Manufacturer	Nov. "	
	John Whiteley Ward	ditto	2 Nov. 1865.	
	William Huntriss	ditto	2 Nov. "	
	James Thistleton Haigh	Gentleman	2 Nov. "	
	William Rothwell	ditto	2 Nov. "	
	William Wightman	Doctor of Medicine	Nov. 1869.	
	Thomas Shaw	Manufacturer	Nov. "	
	John Haigh Fuller	ditto	28 April 1874.	
	Henry Charles McCrea	ditto	28 April "	
	John Holdsworth	ditto	28 April "	
	John Lewis	ditto	28 April "	Not sworn; non-acting.
	Louis John Crossley	ditto	28 April "	
Hanley	The Mayor of the Borough for the time being.		26 May 1859.	Non-acting. Non-resident. Non-acting.
	Francis Wedgwood	Earthenware Manufacturer	26 May "	
	Edward John Ridgway	ditto	26 May "	
	Samuel Keeling	Commission Agent	26 May "	
	Samuel Gleave Walker	Bank Manager	17 Jan. 1867.	
	John Hope	Earthenware Manufacturer	17 Jan. "	
	Thomas Chappell Brown-Westhead.	ditto	17 Jan. "	
	William Henry Yates	Druggist	17 Jan. "	
	Taylor Ashworth	Earthenware Manufacturer	17 Jan. "	
	James William Pankhurst	ditto	17 Jan. "	
	James Meakin	ditto	4 April 1867.	
	Benjamin Boothroyd	Surgeon	17 June 1869.	
	Frederick Wragge	Ironworks Manager	29 July "	
	George Ridgway	Corn Miller	12 Nov. "	
	Edwin Powell	Earthenware Manufacturer	28 Nov. 1872.	
	Thomas Pidduck	Ironmonger	28 Nov. "	
	Edward Fisher Bodley	Earthenware Manufacturer	28 Nov. "	
	Charles Adams	Flint Miller	28 Nov. "	
	Joseph Walton Clementson	Earthenware Manufacturer	28 Nov. "	
	Oliver Lodge	Commission Agent	21 July 1874.	
	Thomas John Keeling	Timber Merchant	11 Aug. "	
	Henry Cartledge	Commission Agent	1 Jan. 1875.	
	Robert Edwin Narramore	ditto	1 Jan. "	
	John Sugden Crapper	Dentist	1 Jan. "	
	Joseph Stephenson	Colour Manufacturer	1 Jan. "	
Hartlepool	George Green	Doctor of Physic	11 Feb. 1852.	Not acting within a year.
	Robert Hunter	Late Harbour Master	11 Feb. "	
	Stephen Robinson	Esquire	11 Feb. "	
	Jans Christian Nielsen	Merchant	9 Nov. 1866.	
	James Groves	Shipowner	9 Nov. "	
	John White	Currier	9 Nov. "	
	George Horsley	Merchant	April 1875.	
	Arthur Macartney	Captain R.A., H.P., Adjutant of Durham Artillery Militia.	April "	
	James Rawlings	Surgeon	April "	
	William Todd	Solicitor	April "	
Harwich	Francis Hales	Esquire	10 June 1846.	Non-resident.
	Cornelius Sharpe	Retired Officer in the Control Department, War Office.	13 May 1841.	
	John Gurney Kelly Burt	Doctor of Medicine	15 May 1857	
	Robert John Bagshaw	Esquire	25 Feb. 1852.	
	John Harvey Nalborough	ditto	29 April 1856.	
	William Colchester	Merchant	15 May 1857	Non-resident.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Harwich—continued -	Oliver John Williams -	Shipping Agent -	22 Mar. 1859.	Non-acting for a year.
	John Bowness -	Major in the Army -	16 June "	
	William Knott -	Surgeon -	16 June "	
	John Watts -	Merchant and Shipowner -	19 Dec. "	
	Luke Richmond -	ditto -	19 Dec. "	
	Robert Nalborough -	Mastmaker -	19 Dec. "	
	William Groom -	Merchant and Shipowner -	15 April 1867.	
	Johnson Richmond -	Shipowner -	15 April "	
	Thomas George -	Notary Public -	2 Mar. 1874.	
	Charles Frederick Bevan -	Chemist -	2 Mar. "	
Hastings -	Howard Elphinstone -	Esquire -	1837 -	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Francis Smith -	ditto -	1841.	
	Wastel Brisco -	ditto -	1842.	
	Francis William Staines -	ditto -	1842 -	Resident, and non-acting.
	Robert Hollond -	ditto -	1848 -	
	George Scrivens -	ditto -	1848.	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Frederic Ticehurst -	Surgeon -	1848.	
	Alfred Burton -	Esquire -	1854.	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Patrick Francis Robertson -	ditto -	1854.	
	Charles Hay Frewen -	ditto -	1856 -	
	Thomas Ross -	ditto -	1862.	
	James Rock -	ditto -	1862.	
	Edward Hayles -	ditto -	1862.	
	Henry Cope Caulfield -	ditto -	1867.	
	Robert Dendney -	Farmer -	1867.	
	Edward Barker Sutton -	Esquire -	1867 -	Non-resident.
	George Gipps -	ditto -	1867.	
	Charles Edward Beeching -	Banker -	1872.	
	Vandeleur Benjamin Crake -	Esquire -	1872.	
	Richard George Amherst Luard -	Late a Colonel in Her Majesty's 62nd Regiment.	1872.	
	Stephen Putland -	Merchant -	1872.	
	Peyton Blakiston -	Doctor of Physic -	1854.	
	George Archibald Thorpe (Mayor).	Esquire.		
	Charles Henry Gausden (Deputy Mayor).	ditto.		
Haverfordwest, Town and County.	Robert Dudley Ackland -	Esquire -	July 1868.	Non-resident.
	James Higgon -	ditto -	July 1847.	
	John Higgon -	ditto -	Oct. 1857 -	
	John Harvey -	Land Agent -	May 1866.	
	John Bryant Henley -	Gentleman -	May "	Non-resident.
	Stuard Spear Morgan -	Esquire -	June 1869.	
	John Madocks -	Gentleman -	April 1868.	
	William Owen -	Esquire -	April 1851.	
	William Stephenson Owen -	Barrister-at-Law -	Jan. 1865.	These gentlemen were appointed by the Lord Chancellor as the nomination of the Lord Lieutenant of the Town and County of Haverfordwest.
	Thomas Rule Owen -	Land Agent -	May 1866.	
	Morris William Lloyd Owen -	Esquire -	Nov. 1869.	
	John Owen -	Colonel of Militia -	June 1873.	
	John William Phillips -	Solicitor -	Oct. 1869.	
	George Rowe -	Surgeon -	Oct. 1858.	
	Thomas Rowlands -	Gentleman -	Jan. "	
	John Henry Scourfield, Esq. -	Member of Parliament -	Jan. 1842.	
	John Lort Stokes -	Retired Rear Admiral -	May 1873.	
	John Arthur Scourfield -	Captain in Army -	Jan. 1875.	
	Thomas Skone -	Esquire -	June 1873.	
	Joseph Thomas -	Merchant -	June "	
	James Thomas -	Clerk in Holy Orders -	Jan. 1842.	
			Borough Justices.	
	Edward Thomas (Mayor) -	Gentleman -	-	
	John James (ex-Mayor) -	Land Agent -	-	
Helston -	Matthew Paul Moyle -	Surgeon -	1849 -	No. Non-acting.
	John Jope Rogers -	Land Owner -	1866 -	
	Charles Lemon Frazier Daniell -	Esquire -	1866 -	
	Thomas Hyne Edwards -	Conveyancer -	1869 -	No.
	Frederick Penberthy -	Retired Draper -	1869 -	
	Henry Roberts -	Draper -	1873 -	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.	
	Name.	Profession.			
Hereford, City -	In the Commission of the Peace :				
	James Jay - - - -	Solicitor - - - -	About 1851 -	All acting Justices.	
	Thomas Theophilus Davies - -	Retired Bookseller - -	About Nov. 1856		
	John Harward Griffiths - -	Barrister-at-Law - -	About Feb. 1859.		
	Thomas Ambrey Court - -	Grocer - - - -	About May 1863.		
	Richard Hereford - - - -	No Profession - - - -	About Nov. 1866.		
	Thomas Cam - - - -	Retired Surgeon - - - -			
	Evan Pateshall - - - -	Retired Solicitor - - - -			
	Charles Lingen - - - -	Surgeon - - - -			
	Josiah Webbe Goldsworthy - -	Retired Major General in the Army.			
	Charles Anthony - - - -	Proprietor of the "Hereford Times" Newspaper.	About 1870 -		
	Edwin Edward Bosley - - - -	Grocer - - - -	9 Jan. 1873		
	Henry Graves Bull - - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - - -	9 Jan. "		
	Joseph Carless - - - -	Retired Butcher - - - -	9 Jan. "		
	Sir Herbert Croft, Bart. - -	Barrister-at-Law - - - -	9 Jan. "		
	John Morris - - - -	Retired Surgeon, but acting as such to Hereford Militia.	9 Jan. "		
	James Rankin - - - -	No Profession - - - -	9 Jan. "		
	Thomas Nourse Underwood - -	Captain in the Navy - - - -	9 Jan. "		
	John Walker - - - -	No Profession - - - -	9 Jan. "		
	Not in the Commission of the Peace, but elected Mayor :				
	Orlando Shellard - - - -	Surveyor and Valuer - - - -	9 Nov. 1874	Non-acting for upwards of a year.	
	Francis Edward Guise - - - -	Barrister-at-Law - - - -	—		
	(Recorder).				
	John Smitheman - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	- Jan. 1856.		
	Henry Gilbertson - - - -	Grocer - - - -	- Aug. 1858.		
Henry Squire - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	- Dec. 1862.			
Jasper Gripper - - - -	Maltster - - - -	- Nov. 1865			
Edward Manser - - - -	Seed Crusher - - - -	- Nov. "			
George Ludlow - - - -	Steward of Christ's Hospital - -	- Jan. 1867.			
Charles Adams - - - -	Merchant - - - -	- Jan. 1873.			
John Woodhouse - - - -	Surgeon and Doctor of Medicine.	- Jan. "			
Samuel Neale - - - -	Draper - - - -	- Jan. "			
Robert Cocks - - - -	- ditto - - - -	- Jan. "			
Henry Rayment - - - -	Grocer - - - -	- Jan. "			
William Baker (ex-Mayor) - -	Brewer - - - -	9 Nov. "			
Edward Augustus Simson - -	Printer - - - -	9 Nov. 1874			
(Mayor).					
Luddersfield -	David Sykes, Esq. (Mayor) -	Gentleman - - - -	20 May 1870.	Does not act. He is entitled to sit as ex-Mayor. Non-resident, and non-acting for more than a year.	
	Wright Mellor, Esq. -	Doctor of Law - - - -	20 May "		
	Henry Brooke, Esq. (ex-Mayor)	Manufacturer - - - -	20 May "		
	Charles Henry Jones, Esq. -	Gentleman - - - -	20 May "		
	The Hon. Charles Gounter Legge.	- - - -	- - - -		
	George Armitage, Esq., D.L. -	Manufacturer - - - -	20 May "		
	Josh. Crosland, Esq. -	- ditto - - - -	20 May "		
	Edward Huth, Esq. -	Merchant - - - -	20 May "		
	Jere Kaye, Esq. -	Gentleman - - - -	20 May "		
	Alfred Crowther, Esq. -	Manufacturer - - - -	20 May "		
	William Shaw, Esq. -	- ditto - - - -	20 May "		
	John Crawshaw, Esq. -	Colliery Proprietor - - - -	20 May "		
	John Day, Esq. -	Manufacturer - - - -	20 May "		
	John Fligg Brigg, Esq. -	Merchant - - - -	20 May "		
	Edward John Wood Waterhouse, Esq.	- - - -	- - - -		
	Charles Hust, Esq. -	Woolstapler - - - -	20 May "		
	Lythe -	Thomas Denne - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	30 April 1857	Non-acting. Ill.
		John Taylor - - - -	- ditto - - - -	10 Feb. 1859	
		John Bery Andrews - - - -	- ditto - - - -	10 Feb. "	
		George Blicke Champion Crespigney.	Major in Army - - - -	10 Feb. "	
		Thomas Bayden - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	13 April 1872	Non-acting. Ill.
		Henry Cobb Wildash - - - -	- ditto - - - -	13 April "	
		Henry Bean Mackeson - - - -	Brewer - - - -	—	
		(Mayor).			

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or, Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Ipswich - - -	Thomas D'Eye Burroughes -	Gentleman - - -	- Jan. 1842.	Not acting for upward of a year. Resident at Sproughton, within seven miles of the Borough. Not acting for upwards of a year. Not resident within seven miles of the Borough, and not acting for upwards of a year. Not acting for upwards of a year.
	Charles Burton - - -	- ditto - - -	- June 1851.	
	George Green Sampson -	Surgeon - - -	- June "	
	Henry Philipps - - -	Lieutenant Colonel -	- Sept. 1852	
	Samuel Belcher Chapman -	Gentleman - - -	- Sept. "	
	The Right Hon. Peter Robert Baron Gwydyr.	Peer of the Realm -	27 Jan. 1853	
	Ebenezer Goddard - - -	Civil Engineer - - -	28 April 1859.	
	Henry Cooper Bond - - -	Leather Merchant - -	28 April "	
	Barrington Chevallier -	Doctor of Medicine -	28 April "	
	Henry Orford - - -	Farmer - - -	- April "	
	Walton Turner - - -	Leather Merchant - -	28 April "	
	George Constantine Edgar Bacon.	Banker - - -	28 April "	
	William Mumford - - -	Surgeon - - -	28 April "	
	Charles Chambers Hammond -	- ditto - - -	- April 1863	
	Edward Grimwade - - -	Druggist - - -	- April "	
	Samuel Harrison Cowell -	Stationer - - -	8 May 1866.	
	Robert Charles Ransome -	Ironfounder - - -	25 Aug. 1870.	
Kendal - - -	Samuel Rhodes (Mayor <i>ex officio</i>).	Gentleman - - -	9 Nov. 1874.	
	George Braithwaite Crewdson	- ditto - - -	8 Oct. 1841.	
	John Whitwell - - -	Manufacturer - - -	15 Nov. 1855.	
	William Henry Wakefield -	Banker - - -	15 Nov. "	
	John Hudson - - -	Gentleman - - -	11 Dec. 1868.	
	William Wakefield - - -	Banker - - -	11 Dec. "	
	George Foster Braithwaite (also <i>ex officio</i> as ex-Mayor).	Manufacturer - - -	11 Dec. "	
Kidderminster - - -	Joseph Kiteley - - -	Gentleman - - -	1849.	Non-resident, and not acting for a year.
	William Roden - - -	Doctor of Medicine -	1849.	
	John Brinton - - -	Carpet Manufacturer -	1857.	
	George Turton - - -	Ironfounder - - -	1857.	
	Samuel Fawcett - - -	Gentleman - - -	1859.	
	Henry Jecks Dixon - - -	Carpet Manufacturer -	1859.	
	Thomas Banks - - -	Gentleman - - -	1865.	
	Alfred Talbot - - -	- ditto - - -	1867 - - -	
	Charles Edward Jefferies -	Carpet Manufacturer -	1869.	
	Henry Toye Woodward -	- ditto - - -	1871.	
	Henry Dixon - - -	- ditto - - -	1873.	
	William Green - - -	- ditto - - -	1873.	
	Joseph Naylor - - -	Worsted Spinner - -	1873.	
King's Lynn - - -	William Taylor - - -	Esquire - - -	1837 - - -	Non-resident.
	Francis Hulton - - -	Merchant - - -	1837 - - -	
	Joseph Wales - - -	Esquire - - -	1847.	
	William Clifton - - -	Merchant - - -	1847.	
	William Burkitt - - -	- ditto - - -	1864.	
	Robert Cook - - -	Esquire - - -	1864.	
	George Holditch - - -	Merchant - - -	1864.	
	William Monement - - -	Esquire - - -	- - -	
	Edward Elmer Durrant -	Civil Engineer - - -	1867.	
	Henry Bradfield Plowright -	Ironmonger - - -	1867.	
	John Dyker Thew - - -	Printer and Publisher -	1868.	
	William Clifton, jun. - -	Corn and Wine Merchant -	1873.	
	James Saddleton Marsters -	Flax Manufacturer - -	1873.	
	George William Wood - -	Gentleman - - -	1873.	
	John Goddard Wigg - - -	- ditto - - -	1873.	
Kingston-upon-Hull -	Charles Wells (Mayor) - -	Merchant and Shipowner -	Nov. 1874.	Non-resident. Non-acting. Non-resident.
	William Cole Beasley - -	Recorder - - -	Dec. "	
	Boswell Middleton Jalland -	Esquire - - -	April 1836.	
	William Baldwin Carrick -	- ditto - - -	April "	
	Thomas Newmarch - - -	- ditto - - -	April "	
	Thomas William Palmer - -	- ditto - - -	1840	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Kingston-upon-Hull - —continued.	John Egginton - - - - Thomas Henry Travis - - - Sir Henry Cooper, Knight - Joseph Walker Pease - - John Crowther Metcalfe Har- rison. Francis Hoare - - - - William Irving - - - - John Lumsden - - - - Henry John Atkinson - - Anthony Bannister - - Robert Jameson - - - - John Fountain - - - - Joseph Armytage Wade - John Love Seaton - - - Edmund Philip Maxted - - John Saner, junior - - - Thomas Walker Flint - - - William Bailey - - - - Henry Frederick Smith - - John Pearson Bell - - -	Banker - - - - Stipendiary Police Magis- trate. Doctor of Physic - - - Banker - - - - Esquire - - - - - ditto - - - - Flax Merchant - - - Shipowner - - - - Esquire - - - - Coal Merchant - - - Timber Merchant - - - Esquire - - - - Timber Merchant - - - Merchant - - - - - ditto - - - - Esquire - - - - Merchant - - - - Shipowner - - - - Seed Crusher - - - Doctor of Medicine - - -	1840. Sept. 1854 1854. 1854. April 1866. April " April " April " July " July " June 1871. June " June " March 1875. March " March " March " March " March " March "	*Non-resident.
Kingston-upon-Thames	George Vesey - - - - Samuel Ranyard - - - - Frederick Gould - - - - Edmund Hunter Fricker - Samuel Mason - - - - Edmund Lowe - - - - William Hardman - - - Joseph Marsh - - - - Alfred Priest - - - - Benjamin Looker - - - Thomas Clements - - - Edward Cock - - - - Henry Shrubsole - - - Bedford Marsh, Esq. The Mayor for the time being is a member of the Bench.	Esquire - - - - - ditto - - - - Chemist - - - - Timber Merchant - - - Builder - - - - Draper - - - - Esquire - - - - Miller - - - - Engineer - - - - Brick and Tile Manufacturer - Esquire - - - - Surgeon - - - - Esquire - - - - 		

* Non-resident, as not residing within the seven miles of the Borough as required by 3 & 6 Will. 4, c. 76, s. 98.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Leeds—continued	William Kelsall	Woollen Merchant	1862.	
	Obadiah Nussey	ditto	1866.	
	Samuel Hey	Surgeon	1867.	
	Richard Bickerton Turner	Banker	1867.	
	Anthony Tittley	Flax Spinner	1867.	
	Robert John Hudson	Oil Merchant	1867.	
	John Rhodes	Share Broker	1867.	
	Henry Oxley	Banker	1867.	
	Thomas John Kinnear	Woollen Merchant	1867.	
	Sir Andrew Fairbairn	Engineer	1867	Non-resident. Stipendiary Magistrate.
	William Bruce	Barrister-at-Law	1869	
	William Middleton	Out of business	1871.	
	Joseph Hirst	Woollen Merchant	1872.	
	John Barran	Merchant	1875.	
	John Octavius Butler	Iron Master	1875.	
	Thomas Richards Harding	Machine Maker	1875.	
	Henry Hudson	Woollen Merchant	1875.	
	William Lawies Jackson	Tanner	1875.	
	Arthur Tredgold Lawson	Engineer	1875.	
	Henry Rowland Marsden	ditto	1875.	
	John Musgrave Sagar-Musgrave	Gentleman	1875.	
	John William Naylor	Engineer	1875.	
	George Taylor	Ironmaster	1875.	
Leicester	Charles Harding (Mayor)	Corn Factor	9 Nov. 1874 <i>ex officio.</i>	
	William Kempson (ex-Mayor)	Gentleman	9 Nov. 1873 <i>ex officio.</i>	
	George Shaw	Doctor of Medicine	1841	Non-acting. Non-resident and non-acting.
	William Biggs	Gentleman	1850	
	John Dove Harris	ditto	1857	Non-acting.
	Alfred Burgess	ditto	1857	
	Samuel Stephens Bankart	ditto	1857	Non-acting.
	Alfred Cooper	ditto	1857	
	Isaac Harrison	ditto	1862.	
	Edward Shipley Ellis	ditto	1862.	
	Thomas Dennis Paul	ditto	1862.	
	Samuel Viccars	Woolstapler	1862.	
	Richard Angrave	Hosier	1867.	
	Charles Richard Crossley	Surgeon	1867.	
	John Howcutt	Seed Merchant	1867.	
	William Bowmar	Trimmer, Bleacher, &c.	1867.	
	John Baines	Hosier	1869.	
	George Baines	Spinner	1869.	
	John Thomas Pilgrim	Gentleman	1873.	
	Thomas Fielding Johnson	Spinner	1873.	
	John Stafford	Merchant	1873.	
	William Weston Stretton	Gentleman	1873.	
	William Rowlett	ditto	1873.	
	Alfred Ellis	Merchant	1874.	
	Thomas Merrett Evans	ditto	1874.	
	George Shirley Harris	Hosier	1874.	
	John Higginson	Gentleman	1874.	
	John Sarson	Grocer	1874.	
	William Winterton	Timber Merchant	1874.	
	Thomas James Wheeler	Elastic Web Manufacturer	1867	Non-acting and non-resident.
Leominster	James Bedford	Gentleman	July 1853	Ceased to act for upwards of a year on account of old age.
	Thomas Collett Yeld	ditto	Dec. 1858.	
	Thomas Burlton	Esquire	Feb. 1859	Since placed on the Commission of the Peace for the County, and has ceased to act with the Borough Justices.
	William Gammidge	Draper	June 1865.	
	Josiah Newman	Gentleman	June "	
	William Daggs*	Bank Manager	April 1875.	
	Thomas Graves*	Draper	April "	
	Robert Hayling Woodhouse*	Hop Merchant	April "	

* The Lord Chancellor ordered the names of the gentlemen marked thus (*) to be inserted in the Commission of the Peace, and they qualified themselves on the 22nd of April.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.	
	Name.	Profession.			
Lichfield, City and County.	The Rev. William Gresley	Clerk in Orders	1842	Yes.	
	Richard Greene	Banker	1842		
	Halford Wootton Hewitt	Surgeon, M. D.	1863		
	The Rev. John Muckleston	Clerk in Orders	1863	No.	
	William Elkington	Gentleman	1863		
	Rowland Crosskey	Ironfounder, &c.	1869		
	James Campbell McLean	Clothier	1869		
	Arthur Hinckley	Gentleman	1869		
	Frederick Symonds	Iron Merchant, &c.	1873		
	John Coxon (Mayor)	Farmer	Elected Mayor, 1874.		
Frederick Webb (ex-Mayor)	Gentleman	Elected Mayor, 1873.			
Lincoln, City	R. S. Harvey	Surgeon	1836	Non-resident.	
	W. Rudgard	Merchant	1839.		
	James Snow	Surgeon	1842	Non-acting.	
	R. G. Hill	Surgeon	1845	Non-resident.	
	Charles Seely	Merchant	1855		
	J. C. Torry	Physician	1860		
	N. Clayton	Engineer	1860.	Non-acting.	
	J. Shuttleworth	ditto	1860		
	J. R. Battle	Chemist	1860.		
	Theo. Trotter	Farmer	1860.	Non-resident.	
	J. R. H. Keyworth	Merchant	1863		
	G. Mitchinson	Physician	1863.		
	G. Glasier	Merchant	1863.		
	R. Hall	Auctioneer and Valuer	1866.		
	C. Doughty	Merchant	1866.		
	T. Simpson	Ironmonger	1866.		
	S. Lowe	Surgeon	1866.		
	T. J. N. Brogden	Valuer	1870.		
	J. Ruston	Engineer	1870.		
	J. Foster	Merchant	1870.		
	H. Goddard	Architect	1870.		
The Mayor and ex-Mayor are <i>ex-officio</i> Justices.					
Liskeard	Samuel Bone	Gentleman	5 Mar. 1862	Non-acting from old age.	
	Andrew Hingston	Surgeon	5 Mar. 1862.	Non-acting, not having taken the oaths.	
	Richard Hawke	Banker	7 July 1870		
	John Clark Isaac	Merchant	7 July 1870.		
	Lewis Charles Foster	Banker	21 Sept. 1872.		
	Matthew Loam	Engineer	21 Sept. "		
Liverpool	John Bridge Aspinall, Esq.	Recorder	4 Jan. 1862.	Non-resident.	
	James Aikin, Esq.	Gentleman	20 Mar. 1838.		
	Thomas Darnley Anderson, Esq.	ditto	26 April 1853		
	George Arkle, Esq.	Banker	15 May 1874.		
	Clarke Aspinall, Esq.	Gentleman	27 July 1869.		
	Lawrence Richardson Baily, Esq.	ditto	15 Mar. 1871.		
	Edward Banner, Esq.	ditto	1 Mar. 1875.		
	James Beazley, Esq.	Merchant	28 July 1869.		
	Henry Christie Beloe, Esq.	Accountant	2 Aug. 1869.		
	William Bennett, Esq.	Gentleman	1 Oct. 1866.		
	James Bland, Esq.	Merchant	20 Dec. 1867.	Non-resident.	
	Charles Tricks Bowring, Esq.	ditto	1 Feb. 1864.		
	John Brancker, Esq.	Broker	21 Aug. 1873.		
	Henry Arthur Bright, Esq.	Merchant	9 Mar. 1865.		
	Ralph Brocklebank, jun., Esq.	ditto	28 Dec. 1867.		
	Edward Browne, Esq.	ditto	24 Feb. 1874.		
	Nathaniel Caine, Esq.	Gentleman	1 Feb. 1864.		
	Alfred Castellain, Esq.	Merchant	8 May 1858.		
	Thomas Chilton, Esq.	Gentleman	15 Sept. 1860		
	Francis Anderson Clint, Esq.	Merchant	1 Feb. 1864.		
	Christopher James Corbally, Esq.	ditto	29 Sept. 1860.		
	John Wakefield Cropper, Esq.	ditto	13 Oct. "		
	William Crosfield, Esq.	Gentleman	5 Feb. 1864.		

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE IN THE VARIOUS BOROUGHS AND

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Liverpool—continued -	William Dixon, Esq.	Gentleman	20 Mar. 1838	Non-resident.
	Henry Duckworth, Esq.	Merchant	1 Feb. 1864.	
	Thomas Earle, Esq.	ditto	27 Sept. 1860.	
	Arthur Bower Forwood, Esq.	ditto	15 May 1874.	Non-resident.
	William Bower Forwood, Esq.	ditto	1 Mar. 1875.	
	Philip Frederic Garnett, Esq.	Attorney-at-Law	13 Aug. 1869.	
	Robertson Gladstone, Esq.	Merchant	1848.	Non-resident.
	Robert Gladstone, Esq.	ditto	14 Oct. 1864.	
	Bernard Hall, Esq.	ditto	15 Mar. 1871.	
	Francis Alexander Hamilton, Esq.	ditto	26 April 1853	Non-resident.
	Charles Edward Hamilton, Esq.	ditto	27 Feb. 1875.	
	David Hodgson, Esq.	Gentleman	1 Mar. 1836	
	Thomas Holder, Esq.	Cotton Broker	13 Aug. 1869.	
	George Holt, Esq.	Merchant	1 Feb. 1864.	
	Hugh Hornby, Esq.	ditto	1 Mar. 1836	Non-acting.
	Thomas Dyson Hornby, Esq.	ditto	22 Sept. 1860.	
	Henry Hugh Hornby, Esq.	Cotton Broker	21 Aug. 1873.	
	Joseph Hubback, Esq.	Merchant	15 Sept. 1860.	Non-acting.
	William Henry Jones, Esq.	Gentleman	21 Aug. 1873.	
	Thomas Bulley Job, Esq.	Merchant	1 Mar. 1875.	
	James Jack, Esq.	Engineer	13 May 1874.	Non-acting.
	Edward Lawrence, Esq.	Merchant	7 Sept. 1866.	
	James Lister, Esq.	Gentleman	15 May 1874.	
	Joseph Gibbons Livingston, Esq.	Merchant	8 Sept. 1866.	Non-acting.
	David McIver, Esq.	ditto	21 Aug. 1873.	
	Maxwell Hyslop Maxwell	ditto	15 Sept. 1860.	
	George Melly, Esq.	ditto	15 Sept. "	Non-acting.
	Thomas Mills, Esq.	ditto	18 Sept. "	
	Charles Mozley, Esq.	Banker	20 Sept. "	
	Charles Myers, Esq.	Merchant	23 Dec. 1867.	Non-acting.
	John Patterson, Esq.	ditto	15 Mar. 1871.	
	James Allanson Pictou, Esq.	Architect	6 Mar. 1865.	
	Francis Alexander Frederick	Merchant	21 Aug. 1873.	Non-acting.
	William Prange, Esq.			
	Thomas Stamford Raffles, Esq.	Stipendary	2 Feb. 1860.	
	Samuel Greg Rathbone, Esq.	Merchant	18 Aug. 1859.	Non-acting.
	John Roberts, Esq.	ditto	21 Aug. 1873.	
	Thomas Bland Royden, Esq.	ditto	15 May 1874.	
	Edward Samuelson, Esq.	ditto	6 Sept. 1866.	Non-acting.
	Alexander Shand, Esq.	ditto	24 Dec. 1868.	
	John Johnson Stitt, Esq.	Gentleman	1 Feb. 1864.	
	James Aspinall Tobin, Esq.	Merchant	2 Jan. 1857.	Non-acting.
	John Torr, Esq.	Gentleman	8 May 1858.	
	Charles Turner, Esq.	ditto	7 Jan. 1842	
	Alfred Turner, Esq.	Merchant	20 Dec. 1867.	Non-acting.
	James Tyrer, Esq.	ditto	8 May 1858	
	James Vose, Esq.	Physician	18 Mar. 1871.	
	Edward Whitley, Esq.	Attorney-at-Law	14 Dec. 1868.	Non-acting.
	James Whitty, Esq.	Draper	7 July 1869.	
	John Hays Wilson, Esq.	Engineer	15 Mar. 1871.	
	John Woodruff, Esq.	Gentleman	1 Feb. 1864.	Non-acting.
	John Weightman, Esq.	ditto	15 May 1874.	
Longton - - -	James Glover	Esquire	11 Sept. 1867	Dead.
	Thomas Goddard	Surgeon	11 Sept. "	
	George Parkyns Knocker	Banker	11 Sept. "	
	*Sampson Bridgwood	Merchant	11 Sept. 1867	Acting.
	*Samuel Bridgwood	ditto	11 Sept. "	
	*John Hachett Goddard	ditto	11 Sept. "	
	John Lochett	China Manufacturer	11 Sept. "	
	Joseph Hulse	Merchant	11 Sept. "	
	William Webberley	China Manufacturer	11 Sept. "	
	Thomas Waterhouse Barlow	ditto	11 Sept. "	
The above are on the Permanent Commission.				
Aaron Edwards	Earthenware Manufacturer	9 Nov. 1874	Acting.	
	John Yates Carryer	Pawnbroker		9 Nov. 1873
The above are Justices by virtue of their office, Mr. Edwards being the present Mayor, and Mr. Carryer ex-Mayor.				

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Louth	James Fowler (Mayor)	Architect	9 Nov. 1874.	Not acting for a year.
	Cornelius Parker	Gentleman	- Sept. 1849.	
	Tom Day Ditchett	Surgeon	- Jan. 1855	
	William Chaplin	Gentleman	- Mar. 1867	
	Frederick Septimus Tate	Surgeon	- Mar. "	Not acting, through illness.
	Thomas Mason	Gentleman	- Mar. "	
	Charles Michell Nesbitt	Bank Manager	- Jan. 1870.	
	John Bell	Gentleman	- April 1873.	
	Thomas Murphy	Doctor of Medicine	- April "	
	Charles Bowman	Gentleman	- April "	
Ludlow	Frederick Fawcett	Doctor of Medicine	- April "	Resident.
	Thomas Elkington Smith (ex-Mayor).	Merchant	-	
	John Adney (Mayor)	Currier	* 9 Nov. 1874	
	Thomas Sheppard (ex-Mayor)	Wine Merchant	* 9 Nov. 1873	
	James Davies	Gentleman	* 25 June 1853	Resident, but from ill-health has not taken an active part for some time.
	Alfred Salwey	ditto	* 6 Jan. 1875	
	George Cocking	Druggist	* 16 July 1873	Overton, near Ludlow.
	John Southern	Surgeon	* 16 July "	
	Richard Kyeke Penson	Gentleman	* 16 July "	
Lyme Regis	Charles Cowper Benett	Captain, R.N.	About 1840	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Edward O. Lee	No occupation	- ditto -	
	Thomas Hussey	Esquire	- ditto -	Non-resident.
	Jonathan Fowler	Retired Lieutenant Colonel	16 Dec. 1863	
	John Mitchell	Retired Tradesman	16 Dec. "	Acting.
	Henry Tucker	Licentiate of Apothecaries' Hall.	16 Dec. "	
	Frederic Hinton	Solicitor	About Dec. 1866	
Macclesfield	Samuel Greg	Cotton Spinner	18 Dec. 1837	Non-resident, but attends about once or twice a year.
	William Coare Brocklehurst	Silk Manufacturer	28 May 1852	
	Thomas Stringer	Gentleman	16 Dec. 1859	Has never qualified nor acted; non-resident.
	William Bullock	Silk Merchant	31 May 1861	
	James Bland	Surgeon	12 June 1867	
	William Barker	Silk Manufacturer	12 June "	
	David Clarke	Gentleman	12 June "	
	George Godwin	ditto	12 June "	
	Richard Wright	ditto	12 June "	
	Ferdinando Jackson	Silk Manufacturer	12 June "	
	Joseph Wright	ditto	12 June "	
	James Swinnerton	Printer and Stationer	28 June 1872	
	John Barnett Wadsworth	Silk Manufacturer	28 June "	
	Robert Brodrick	ditto	30 Dec. 1874	
	William Wilshaw Cornes	ditto	30 Dec. "	
	John Stringer	Gentleman	30 Dec. "	
Maidenhead	Francis Goolden	Surgeon	1856.	Died, 22nd May 1875. Absent 11 months last year; attends but very seldom. Constant in his attendance.
	Henry Samuel Powis	Doctor of Medicine, retired	1866	
	James Daniel Pearce	Schoolmaster	1868	
	Richard Suter	Gentleman	1873	
	Henry H. Durrant (Mayor)	-	1855, 1865, 1873, 1874, and 1875.	
Maidstone	Henry Hughes (Mayor)	Attorney-at-Law	9 Nov. 1874.	
	Thomas Franklyn	Wine Merchant	- Mar. 1842.	
	Charles Arkcoll	Wholesale Grocer	- April 1854.	
	Henry Winkles Joy	Surgeon	- Sept. 1858.	
	William Laurence	Wholesale Grocer	- May 1866.	
	Charles Ellis	Iron Merchant	- May "	
	George Wickham	Esquire	- Dec. "	
	David Stephen White	ditto	- May 1868.	
	George Edmett	Wholesale Clothier	- Nov. 1869.	

* These dates are the dates of qualification, not the dates of appointment.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Maidstone—continued	John Barcham Green	Paper Manufacturer	- Nov. 1869.	
	James Clifford	Esquire	- Nov. "	
	Stephen Monckton	Physician	- Nov. "	
	William Haynes	Iron Merchant	- July, 1872.	
	Frederic Pine	Corn Merchant	- July "	
	John Hyde Hills	Tailor	- Sept. 1874.	
Maldon	George Parker May	Doctor of Medicine	1853.	
	Rev. Edward Russell Horwood	Clerk	1858.	
	Thomas Tomlinson	Surgeon	1858.	
	John Thorp	- ditto	1858.	
	Henry Ward	Miller	1858	Non-acting for 12 months.
	William Humpherys	Draper	1867.	
	Thomas Charles Sewell	Wine Merchant	1867	Non-resident, and non-acting for 12 months.
	Sampson Hanbury	Merchant	1867.	
	Henry Thomas Eve	- ditto	1871.	
	James Barritt	Farmer	1871.	
	Robert Smith	Currier	1872.	
	Alfred Warren	Merchant	1874.	
	George Pennington Jay	Auctioneer	1874.	
Manchester	Sir E. Armitage, Knight	Gentleman	20 Feb. 1839	
	Daniel Lee, Esq.	Merchant	20 Feb. "	
	Charles James Stanley Walker, Esq.	Gentleman	20 Feb. "	Non-acting.
	Murray Gladstone, Esq.	- ditto	16 Sept. 1843	
	Matthew Kennedy, Esq.	- ditto	1 April 1846	Non-resident <i>pro tem</i> ; acted within 12 months.
	Thomas Bayley Potter, Esq., M.P.	- ditto	16 Oct. 1849	Non-acting.
	Charles Hilditch Rickards, Esq.	- ditto	30 July 1851.	
	Benjamin Nicholls, Esq.	- ditto	9 Nov. 1853.	
	Sir James Watts, Knight	Merchant	9 Nov. 1855.	
	Edward Hardcastle, Esq., M.P.	- ditto	13 Dec. 1858.	
	George Walker, Esq.	- ditto	20 Feb. 1859.	
	Matthew Curtis, Esq.	Engineer	9 Nov. 1860	
	Abel Heywood, Esq.	Stationer	9 Nov. 1862	Non-acting.
	John Marsland Bennett, Esq.	Merchant	20 July 1863.	
	Paul F. Wellert, Esq.	Gentleman	8 May 1864.	
	James Dorrington, Esq.	- ditto	17 Sept. 1866.	
	George Peel, Esq.	Engineer	17 Sept. "	
	John Howarth Ashton, Esq.	Merchant	18 Oct. "	
	John William Desiré Mather, Esq.	- ditto	7 Nov. "	
	Robert Neill, Esq.	Builder	9 Nov. "	
	Alfred Watkin, Esq.	Merchant	11 Mar. 1867.	
	Henry Anthony Bennett, Esq.	Gentleman	6 April "	
	John Alexander Bremner, Esq.	Merchant	9 April "	
	Ebenezer Robert Le Mare, Esq.	Gentleman	9 April "	Non-resident.
	John William Maclure, Esq.	Insurance Agent	9 April "	
	Alfred Aspland, Esq.	Gentleman	22 July "	
	James Frost Furniss, Esq.	Silversmith	22 July "	
	Herbert Birley, Esq.	Manufacturer	9 Oct. 1868.	
	George Fox, Esq.	Gentleman	9 Oct. 1868.	
	John Grave, Esq.	- ditto	15 Oct. "	
	Herbert Philips, Esq.	Merchant	30 Oct. "	
	George Stanley Darbshire, Esq.	- ditto	16 April 1869.	
	Adam Murray, Esq.	Manufacturer	19 April "	
	Benjamin Armitage, Esq.	- ditto	6 May "	
	William Agnew, Esq.	Picture Dealer	14 June "	
	Wright Turner, Esq.	Manufacturer	19 Aug. "	
	William Cunliffe Brooks, Esq., M.P.	Banker	- Oct. "	Non-acting.
	Charles Thompson, Esq.	Gentleman	4 May 1870.	
	Henry Julius Leppoc, Esq.	- ditto	8 Aug. "	
	Ralph Hall, Esq.	Merchant	22 Nov. "	
	William Howe, Esq.	Gentleman	22 Nov. "	
	Richard Johnson, Esq.	Merchant	22 Nov. "	
	Robert Alexander Kennedy, Esq.	Insurance Agent	22 Nov. "	
	Peter Maclaren, Esq.	Merchant	22 Nov. "	
	Henry Patteson, Esq.	- ditto	22 Nov. "	
	Joseph A. Railton, Esq.	Gentleman	22 Nov. "	
	Joseph Thompson, Esq.	Manufacturer	22 Nov. "	
	William H. Higgin, Esq., Q.C.	Barrister-at-Law	4 Jan. 1871.	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Manchester—continued	William Booth, Esq.	Merchant	9 Nov. 1871.	Non-acting.
	George Booth, Esq.	ditto	2 Mar. 1872.	
	Charles Leigh Clare, Esq.	ditto	12 May 1873.	
	Charles John Galloway, Esq.	Ironfounder	12 May "	
	Benjamin Gray, Esq.	Manufacturer	12 May "	
	William Holland, Esq.	ditto	12 May "	
	John King, jun., Esq.	ditto	12 May "	
	Isaac Hoyle, Esq.	Merchant	27 Feb. 1874.	
	Joseph Simpson, Esq.	Gentleman	27 Feb. "	
	Richard Haworth, Esq.	Manufacturer	8 June "	
	Thomas Rose, Esq.	Insurance Agent	8 June "	
	David Bannerman, Esq.	Merchant	2 Sept. "	
	Thomas Dale, Esq.	Contractor	2 Sept. "	
	John Galloway Esq.	Ironfounder	2 Sept. "	
	Sir E. Watkin	Gentleman	-	
P. B. Ferguson, Esq.	ditto	30 Nov. 1874.		
Richard C. Smith, Esq.	ditto	30 Nov. "		
Samuel Ogden, Esq.	Merchant	14 April 1875.		
Margate	Thomas Blackburn	Esquire	July 1858	No.
	George E. Hannam	ditto	July "	
	George W. Sicklemore	Clerk in Holy Orders	July "	
	Richard Jenkins	Esquire	July "	
	Thomas H. Keble	ditto	Jan. 1867	
	Alexander Brown	Captain in the Royal Navy	Jan. "	
	Frederick Chambers	Doctor of Medicine	Feb. 1874	
Marlborough	Jonah Reeve	Gentleman	1862.	Non-resident.
	Richard Edmonds Price	ditto	1862.	
	Henry Seymour	ditto	1862	
	James Russell	Draper	1866.	
	David Pierce Maurice	Gentleman	1866.	
	William Clark Merriman (ex-Mayor).	ditto	1873	
	James Blake Maurice (Mayor)	Doctor of Medicine	1874	
Middlesbrough	Henry William Ferdinand Bolckow.	Member of Parliament	1853	All acting.
	Isaac Wilson	Ironmaster	1853	
	Henry Thompson	Chemist	1853	
	William Randolph Innes Hopkins.	Ironmaster	1853	
	George Bottomley	Draper	1866	
	William Fallows	Gentleman	1863	
	Edgar Gilkes	Ironmaster	1866	
	James Harris	Sailmaker	1866	
	George Watson	Grocer	1866	
	Henry Cochrane	Ironmaster	1866	
	Thomas Vaughan	ditto	1872	
	Raylton Dixon	Iron Ship Builder	1872	
	John Stevenson	Ironmaster	1872	
	Thomas Brentnall	Ironmonger	1872	
	William Taylor	Merchant	1872	
	Thomas George Robinson	Banker	1875	
	Robert Stephenson	Merchant	1875	
	Robert Lloyd	Ironmaster	1875	
	John Ellerton	Surgeon	1875	
Monmouth	Thomas Gratrex	Banker	21 Feb. 1844	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	William Penry London	Clergyman	22 Mar. 1853	Non-resident.
	Thomas Watkins	Builder	14 Sept. 1858.	Non-acting.
	Henry Gosling	Banker	14 Sept. "	
	Samuel Spilsbury	Gentleman	14 Sept. "	
	Henry Salusbury Milman	Banker	27 April 1867	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	George Willis	Physician	27 April. "	
	John Moore Woollett	Surgeon	30 Sept. 1869.	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Thomas Leach Nicholas	Gentleman	30 Sept. "	
	Thomas James	Bootmaker	14 July 1871.	
Neath	The only persons who can act in this Borough is the Mayor for the time being and ex-Mayor.			

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Newark - - -	John Handley - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	*13 Sept. 1852.	Non-resident within the Borough.
	Philip Handley - - - -	Banker - - - -	*17 July 1865	
	William Newzam Nicholson -	Engineer - - - -	*10 July "	
	Thomas Oldham - - - -	Grocer - - - -	*10 July "	Non-resident within the Borough.
	Thomas Spragging Godfrey -	Banker - - - -	*23 Oct. "	
	Henry Branstons - - - -	Maltster - - - -	*29 July 1872.	
	Edward Mitford Hutton Riddell	Banker - - - -	*29 July "	Non-resident within the Borough.
	Erasmus Welby - - - -	Physician - - - -	*5 Aug. "	
	Grosvenor Hodgkinson - - -	Gentleman - - - -	*8 Aug. "	
Newbury - - -	Charles Laird Slocock - - -	Banker - - - -	15 April 1869	Resides at Donnington, adjoining Newbury.
	James Porteus Jackson - - -	Ironmonger - - - -	15 April "	Resident.
	John Howe Mason - - - -	Grocer - - - -	15 April "	Resides at Donnington.
	Joseph Frederick Hickman - -	Gentleman - - - -	15 April "	Resident.
	Henry Flint - - - -	Coal Merchant - - - -	3 Jan. 1862	
†Newcastle-under-Lyme	Joseph Baidon - - - -	Ironmonger - - - -	1866 - - -	Resident, and acting.
	William Mellard - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1866 - - -	
	William Cartwright - - - -	Chemist - - - -	1866 - - -	
	Joseph Cooper - - - -	Coal Proprietor - - - -	1866 - - -	Non-resident, and acting.
	Ralph Mosley - - - -	Draper - - - -	1868 - - -	
	Charles Massey - - - -	Merchant - - - -	1869 - - -	
	Samuel Edwards - - - -	Auctioneer - - - -	1869 - - -	Resident, and acting.
	John Thomas Arlidge - - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - - -	1873 - - -	
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	Ralph Park Philipson - - - -	Attorney-at-Law - - - -	1837.	Never qualified.
	George Clayton Atkinson - -	Esquire - - - -	1846.	
	Villiers Charles Villers Surtees	Wine Merchant - - - -	1846 - - -	
	James Sillick - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1853.	
	Anthony Nichol - - - -	Oil Merchant - - - -	1858.	
	Isaac Lowthian Bell - - - -	Ironmaster - - - -	1858.	
	Charles Frederick Hamond - -	Barrister-at-Law - - - -	1858.	
	Joseph Laycock - - - -	Coal Owner - - - -	1860.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Joseph Pollard - - - -	Corn Merchant - - - -	1860.	
	Thomas Hedley - - - -	Soap Manufacturer - - - -	1864.	
	John Liddell - - - -	Coal Owner - - - -	1864 - - -	
	Thomas Wilson - - - -	Woollen Merchant - - - -	1864.	
	Addison Potter - - - -	Coal Owner - - - -	1864.	
	William Hawthorn - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1864 - - -	
	William Hunter - - - -	Coal Owner - - - -	1867.	
	Benjamin Plummer - - - -	Merchant - - - -	1867.	
	Henry Milvain - - - -	Ship Owner - - - -	1867.	
	George Hare Philipson - - -	Coach Builder - - - -	1867.	
	Richard Burdon Sanderson - -	Esquire - - - -	1867.	
	James Morrison - - - -	Ironmaster - - - -	1867.	
	Richard Cail - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1874.	
	Thomas Leslie Gregson - - -	Surgeon - - - -	1874.	
	Thomas Bell - - - -	Ironmaster - - - -	1874.	
	John Bulman - - - -	Esquire - - - -	1874.	
	Jonathan Angus - - - -	Woollen Merchant - - - -	1874.	
	George John Cookson - - - -	Lead Manufacturer - - - -	1874.	
	Hilton Philipson - - - -	Attorney-at-Law - - - -	1874.	
	John Burrell - - - -	Manure Manufacturer - - - -	1874.	
	Collingwood Forster Jackson -	Merchant - - - -	1874.	
	Charles Henry Young - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1874.	
	William Haswell Stephenson -	Coal Owner - - - -	1874.	
	John Joseph Hunter - - - -	Merchant - - - -	1874.	
	John Henry Burn - - - -	Coal Owner - - - -	1874.	
Newport (Isle of Wight).	Robert Pinnock (Mayor) - -	Merchant - - - -	- Feb. 1871.	Non-resident, residing more than seven miles from the Borough, and non-acting for upwards of a year.
	William Baron Mew (as ex-Mayor).	Brewer - - - -	9 Nov. 1873.	
	William Major Cooke - - -	Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate.	- Aug. 1863	
	Francis Pittis - - - -	Estate Agent - - - -	- Nov. "	
	Henry Pinnock - - - -	Esquire (no profession) - -	- Nov. "	
	Frederick Vulliamy - - - -	- ditto - ditto - - -	- Nov. 1866.	
	William Stuart Graham - - -	Captain (no profession) - -	- Nov. "	
	William Mortimer - - - -	Esquire - - - -	- Nov. "	
	John Edgar Beckingsale - - -	Surgeon - - - -	- Jan. 1873.	
	Henry Waterworth - - - -	- ditto - - - -	- April 1875.	

* The dates given above are the days on which the declaration and oath were taken.

† Exclusive of the Mayor, who is *ex-officio* a Justice for the Borough during his year of office and the year following.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Newport (Monmouth)	Benjamin Evans (Mayor)	Draper	9 Nov. 1874.	Mr. Hellicar has lived at Bristol many years.
	William Evans	Merchant	1851.	
	John Hellicar	ditto	1851	
	Robert F. Woollett	Surgeon	1851.	
	Samuel Homfray	Esquire		
	Thomas Cordes	Member of Parliament		
	Thomas Gratex	Banker		
	William Williams	Merchant	Several years back; about 1857 or 1858	
	Edward J. Phillips	Chemist		
	Lorenzo A. Homfray	Merchant		
	Charles Lyne	Land Agent		
	William W. Morgan	Surgeon		
	Thomas Beymon	Ship Broker	Aug. 1870.	
	Wyndham Jones	Upholsterer	March 1874.	
	Charles Lewis	Iron Merchant	March "	
	Nelson Hewertson	Timber Merchant	March "	
	Henry Phillips	Iron Merchant	March "	
	George W. Jones	Ship Broker	March "	
	James Murphy	Civil Engineer	March "	
	Jehoiada Brewer	Surgeon	July "	
	James Barkley Gelling	Esquire	July "	
	Robert G. Cullum	Timber Merchant	July "	
	Arthur James Stevens	Iron Founder	July "	
	Thomas P. de Wansbrough	Decorator	July "	
	Joseph Firbank	Railway Contractor	July "	
New Sarum	Samuel Ralph Atkins (Mayor)	Pharmaceutical Chemist	<i>Ex officio</i>	No. Non-resident. No. Non-resident. No. Has not qualified. No. Non-resident. Has not qualified. No. Has not qualified. No.
	Henry Brown (ex-Mayor)	Bookseller	<i>Ex officio</i>	
	Thomas Ogden Stevens	Esquire	1837	
	James Hussey	ditto	1845	
	William Fawcett	ditto	1846	
	Newell Vicary Squarey	Chemist	1851	
	John Alfred Lush, M.D., M.P.	Esquire	1866	
	Henry Philemon Ewer	Auctioneer	1867	
	William Pinckney	Banker	1867	
	Richard Henry Rigden	Land Agent	1867	
	John Waters	Auctioneer	1867	
	Thomas Pain	Gentleman	1867	
	John Style	ditto	1867	
	William Woodlands	ditto	1869	
	Robert Stokes	ditto	1871	
	James Read	Esquire	1872	
	William Price Aylward	ditto	1874	
	John Henry Jacob	ditto	1874	
	Stephen Eldridge	ditto	1874	
Northampton	George Buxton	Esquire	5 Mar. 1836	Resident, and acting. Resident, but non-acting, from infirmity. Resides in the county, but has a place of business in the borough; is non-acting, except by occasionally taking a declaration or attesting a recruit. Resident, and acting.
	William Williams	Leather Seller	- June 1841	
	William Hollis	Shoe Manufacturer	- Aug. 1851	
	William Hensman	Farmer and Grocer	- Jan. 1859	
	Edmund Francis Law	Architect	- Jan. 1859	
	John Phipps the younger	Draper	- Nov. 1860	
	James Berridge Norman	ditto	- May 1868	
	James Barry	Chemist and Druggist	- May "	
	William Adkins	Farmer	- May "	
	Thomas Sheppard	Currier	- May "	
	Pickering Phipps Perry	Miller	- May "	
	Mark Dorman	Bookseller and Stationer	- May "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Norwich - - -	Horatio Bolingbroke - - -	Manufacturer - - -	1837 - - -	Incapacitated by blindness.
	John Henry Gurney - - -	Banker - - -	1847 - - -	Non-resident.
	Abel Towler - - -	Manufacturer - - -	1847. - - -	
	Osborn Springfield - - -	Silk Merchant - - -	1847 - - -	Non-acting for a year, owing to illness.
	William Freeman - - -	- - -	1847 - - -	Non-resident for many years.
	John Betts - - -	Silk Mercer - - -	1848. - - -	
	Henry Woodcock - - -	Gentleman - - -	1852. - - -	
	Robert Chamberlin - - -	Silk Mercer - - -	1852. - - -	
	Edward Copeman - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	1856. - - -	
	Frederick Brown - - -	Merchant - - -	1858. - - -	
	Robert Fitch - - -	Chemist - - -	1858. - - -	
	William John Utten Browne - - -	Esquire - - -	1858. - - -	
	Henry Willett - - -	Manufacturer - - -	1858 - - -	Non-acting for a year.
	Edward Meyrick Goulbourn, D.D. - - -	Dean of Norwich - - -	1866 - - -	Has not qualified.
	Colonel James Cockburn - - -	Colonel of Pensioners - - -	1866 - - -	Non-acting for a year.
	Edward Kerrison Harvey (Mayor). - - -	Esquire - - -	1866. - - -	
	James Meybohn Venning - - -	Gentleman - - -	1866. - - -	
	William Houghton Clabburn - - -	Manufacturer - - -	1866. - - -	
	Jeremiah James Colman, M.P. - - -	Merchant - - -	1869. - - -	
	John Gurney - - -	Banker - - -	1869 - - -	Non-acting for a year.
	William Butcher - - -	Auctioneer - - -	1869. - - -	
	Augustus Frederick Coke Bolingbroke. - - -	Manufacturer - - -	1869. - - -	
	William Peter Nichols - - -	Surgeon - - -	1870. - - -	
	Frederick Bateman - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	1870. - - -	
	Peter Eade - - -	- - ditto - - -	1871. - - -	
	Samuel Gurney Buxton - - -	Banker - - -	1871. - - -	
	Simms Reeve - - -	Barrister-at-Law - - -	1871. - - -	
	George Warren Watts Firth - - -	Surgeon - - -	1871 - - -	Non-acting for a year.
	Alexander Robert Chamberlin. - - -	Silk Mercer - - -	1873. - - -	
	Alfred Master - - -	Surgeon - - -	1873. - - -	
	Thomas Wells - - -	Veterinary Surgeon - - -	1873. - - -	
	John Copeman - - -	Wholesale Grocer - - -	1873 - - -	Non-acting for a year, owing to illness.
	Carlos Cooper - - -	Barrister-at-Law - - -	1873 - - -	Has not qualified.
Nottingham - - -	Thomas Close - - -	Gentleman - - -	16 Nov. 1837 - - -	Non-acting.
	William Vickers - - -	- ditto - - -	1841 - - -	
	Joseph Braithwaite - - -	- ditto - - -	1841 - - -	
	John Lawson Thackeray - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	1858. - - -	
	Frederick John Hadden - - -	Hosiery Manufacturer - - -	1858 - - -	Non-resident.
	James Holwell Lee - - -	- - ditto - - -	1865. - - -	
	Francis Butcher Gill - - -	Gentleman - - -	1865 - - -	Non-resident.
	William Windley - - -	Silk Throwster - - -	1865. - - -	
	William Gibson - - -	Hosiery Manufacturer - - -	1867. - - -	
	Thomas Ball - - -	Banker - - -	1867. - - -	
	John Charles Lory Marsh - - -	Physician - - -	1867 - - -	Non-resident.
	William Archibald Patterson - - -	Silk Throwster - - -	1867. - - -	
	Anthony John Mundella, M.P. - - -	Gentleman - - -	1870 - - -	Non-resident.
	Henry Abel Smith - - -	Banker - - -	1870 - - -	Non-acting.
	John Barber - - -	Grocer - - -	1870. - - -	
	David New - - -	Iron Merchant - - -	1870. - - -	
	Richard Birkin - - -	Gentleman - - -	1870. - - -	
	James Oldknow - - -	Lace Manufacturer - - -	1870. - - -	
	John Brown - - -	Wine and Spirit Merchant - - -	1875. - - -	
	John Pearson Cox - - -	Gentleman - - -	1875. - - -	
	Robert Evans - - -	Architect - - -	1875. - - -	
	Thomas Forman - - -	Printer and Newspaper Proprietor. - - -	1875. - - -	
	Henry Heymann - - -	Lace Manufacturer - - -	1875. - - -	
	William Lambert - - -	Lace Dresser - - -	1875. - - -	
	Joseph Littlewood - - -	Surgeon - - -	1875. - - -	
	Thomas Rawstorn Starey - - -	Carriage Builder - - -	1875. - - -	
	Henry Taylor - - -	Surgeon - - -	1875. - - -	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.			
	Name.	Profession.					
*Oldham - - -	John Scholes Hague - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	†16 Dec. 1857	Has not been on the bench for upwards of a year. Has not been on the bench for upwards of a year.			
	Abraham Leach - - -	Surgeon - - -	16 Dec. "				
	James Radcliffe - - -	Cotton Manufacturer - - -	16 Dec. "				
	Josiah Radcliffe - - -	- - ditto - - -	16 Dec. "				
	Samuel Radcliffe - - -	- - ditto - - -	16 Dec. "	Has not been on the bench for upwards of a year. Has not been on the bench for upwards of a year.			
	John Riley - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	16 Dec. "				
	Edward Abbott Wright - - -	Esquire - - -	16 Dec. "				
	Thomas Evans Lees - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	14 Mar. 1867.				
	John Taylor - - -	- - ditto - - -	21 Mar. "	Has not been on the bench for upwards of a year. Has not been on the bench for upwards of a year.			
	William Knott - - -	Hat Manufacturer - - -	30 Mar. "				
	Richard Shiers, jun. - - -	Cotton Manufacturer - - -	6 April "				
	William Rye - - -	Machinist - - -	5 May 1869.				
	Charles Suthers - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	5 May "				
	Thomas Emmott - - -	- - ditto - - -	3 July "				
	Abraham Crompton - - -	- - ditto - - -	Qualified at the Quarter Sessions in pursuance of the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871; unknown.				
	Edward Mayall - - -	- - ditto - - -					
	William Wrigley - - -	Estate Agent and Valuer - - -					
	George Bentley Neile - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -					
	Edward Collinge - - -	Cotton Spinner and Manufacturer.					
	Eli Harrop - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -					
	Samuel Taylor - - -	Cotton Spinner and Manufacturer.					
	John Jackson Shiers - - -	- - - ditto - - -					
Oswestry - - -	1st. <i>Ex Officio</i> :						
	Thomas Pryce Parry (Mayor)	Skinner - - -	9 Nov. 1874.	Non-resident.			
	Charles Witley Owen (ex-Mayor).	Wine Merchant - - -	9 Nov. 1873.				
	John Robert Kenyon, Esq. (Recorder).	Barrister-at-Law, q.c. - - -	- June 1842				
	‡2nd. By Commission:						
	William Watkin Edward Wynne.	Esquire - - -	§25 Mar. 1850	Non-resident, and non-acting for upwards of a year.			
	Edmund Wright - - -	Ditto - - -	25 Nov. 1854	Non-acting for upwards of a year.			
	James Thomas Jones - - -	Bunker - - -	25 Feb. 1862.				
	James Richardson Barnes - - -	Esquire - - -	9 Feb. 1866.				
	Benjamin Roberts - - -	Corn Miller - - -	9 Feb. "				
	Edward Wynne Hawes - - -	Retired Draper - - -	9 Feb. "	Names inserted in Commission in 1868, but have never been sworn in.			
	George Owen - - -	Civil Engineer - - -	16 Nov. 1868.				
	Thomas Savin - - -	Contractor - - -	16 Mar. 1872.				
	John Thomas - - -	Maltster - - -	16 Mar. "				
	John Askew Roberts - - -	Retired Printer - - -	16 Mar. "				
	John Henneker Lovett - - -	Esquire - - -					
	George Hammerton Crump - - -	- - -					
	Oxford, City - - -	Jonathan Samuel Browning - - -			Ironmonger - - -	1837.	
		John Calcutt - - -			Brick Maker - - -	1874.	
		John Richard Carr - - -	Gentleman - - -		1870.		
		John Caldecott Cavell - - -	Mercer and Draper - - -	1870.			
		Samuel Lavington Evans - - -	- - ditto - - -	1874.			
John Galpin - - -		Auctioneer and Timber Merchant.	1874.				
Isaac Grubb - - -		Corn Factor - - -	1856.				
James Hughes - - -		Provision Merchant - - -	1870.				
John Juggins - - -		Men's Mercer - - -	1874.	Non-resident, except by the retention of a room and an office. Has not acted for upwards of a year.			
Robert Pike - - -		Auctioneer - - -	1874.				
James Pike - - -		Hop Merchant - - -	1856 - - -				
Thomas Randall - - -		Gentleman - - -	1870.				
Edwin Thomas Spiers - - -		Retired Wine Merchant - - -	1870.	Disqualified by reason of a composition with his creditors.			
Richard James Spiers - - -		Stationer and Perfumer - - -	1856 - - -				
John Towle - - -		Paper Manufacturer - - -	1856.				
Charles Underhill - - -		Grocer - - -	1874.				
William Ward - - -		Coal Merchant - - -	1856.				
George Ward - - -		Gentleman - - -	1870.				
James Wyatt - - -		Printseller - - -	1874.				

* The Commission of the Peace does not contain the dates of appointment of Justices.

† The dates given are the dates of qualification, not the dates of appointment.

‡ The Commission, dated 20th November, 1 Vict. does not show the date of the appointment of the above Justices, all of whose names have been subsequently inserted therein.

§ These dates given are the dates of swearing in, not the dates of appointment.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Pembroke - - -	William Williams (Mayor)	Timber Merchant	9 Nov. 1874.	
	William Hulm	Banker	26 Sept. 1854.	
	James Robeston Bryant	Surgeon	31 May 1852.	
	James Cocks	Gentleman	8 Nov. 1861.	
	Spencer William Hustler	ditto	14 Dec. 1866.	
	Douglas Arthur Reid	Surgeon	14 Dec. "	
	William Dawkins	Gentleman	16 Dec. 1868.	
	Robert Morgan Jones	Agent, &c.	19 Sept. 1874.	
	Joshua William Morison	Surgeon	19 Sept. "	
	Thomas McMaster	Timber Merchant	19 Sept. "	
Penryn - - -	James Fenton Stamper	Surgeon	19 Sept. "	
	David Aird	Commander in Royal Navy (retired).	19 Sept. "	
	James Bird Read	Retired Merchant	*14 June 1855	Resident, and acting.
	George Wilson Trener	Surgeon	1 Sept. 1866	
	Michael Jenkin Lavin	Draper	9 Oct. "	Non-resident, and acting.
	George Gibbs Powell	Builder	4 Jan. 1869	
	Joel Blamey	Merchant	15 Feb. 1873	Resident, and acting.
	John Mend	Paper Manufacturer	15 Feb. "	
	John Reed Rawe	Merchant	11 April 1874	
Penzance - - -	William Henry Rodd (Mayor)	Gentleman	9 Nov. 1874.	Non-resident (at present). Often very ill. Does not now act.
	John Josias Arthur Boase	Banker	17 Nov. 1837	
	John Batten	Esquire	- - -	
	Thomas Simon Bolitho	Banker	24 Jan. 1840	
	Francis Boase	Surgeon	21 Dec. 1869.	
	John Richards Branwell	Merchant	14 Sept. 1874.	
	Richard Roberts Victor	Draper	14 Sept. "	
	James Barclay Montgomery	Physician	19 Oct. "	
Plymouth - - -	William Foster Moore (Mayor)	Shipbuilder, &c.	*9 Nov. 1874	Appointed for one year Mayor, and one year Justice of the Peace. Ceases to be Justice on 9th November 1875.
	Alfred Rooker (ex-Mayor)	Solicitor	9 Nov. 1873	
	Thomas Hilliersden Bulteel	Banker	11 Sept. 1848	
	William Burnell	Gentleman	10 Aug. 1854	Non-acting for many years. Non-acting for several years.
	Augustus Frederick Tracey	Retired Captain, Royal Navy	23 Nov. 1858.	
	William Luscombe	Foreign Consul and Ship Agent.	29 Jan. 1860.	Non-acting for several years.
	Richard Hicks	Gentleman	29 Jan. "	
	Charles Norrington	Manure Merchant	6 Mar. 1865.	
	Henry Brown	Warehouseman	6 Mar. "	
	John Fincher Trist	Gentleman	13 Dec. 1866.	
	James Blackmore Wilcocks	ditto	13 Dec. "	
	Alfred Hingston	Banker	12 Oct. 1869.	
	Alexander Hubbard	Gentleman	4 Mar. 1871.	
	William Radford	Draper and Silk Mercer	4 Mar. "	
	Richard Rundle	Warehouseman	4 Mar. "	
	John Elliott	Retired Colonel Royal Marine Light Infantry, and Adjutant of Volunteers.	4 Mar. "	
Pontefract - - -	Mark Pearson, Esq. (Mayor)	Tea Dealer	5 April 1875	Resident, and acting.
	Robert Oxley, Esq.	Doctor of Physic	5 April 1853	
	Charles Grabbam, Esq.	ditto	1872	Resident, but non-acting.
	Henry Muscroft, Esq.	ditto	1872	
	Roger Hurst, Esq.	Maltster	1847	Resident, and acting.
	Richard Moxon, Esq.	Ditto	- Feb. 1858	
	David Longstaff, Esq.	Liquorice Merchant	- Feb. "	Resident within two miles of the borough, and acting.
	George Scott Robson, Esq.	Maltster	- Jan. 1867	
	William Jefferson, Esq.	Late Schoolmaster (now retired).	- Jan. "	
	John Routledge, Esq.	Grocer and Draper	- Oct. 1870	Resident, and acting.
	John Moxon, Esq.	Maltster	- Oct. "	
	William Booth, Esq.	No occupation	5 April 1875	
	Thomas Jowett, Esq.	ditto	5 April "	

* These dates given are not the dates of appointment, but the dates of taking the oath of office.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Poole	John Gosse	Retired Merchant	1 April 1841	Non-acting on bench.
	Thomas Slade	ditto	8 May 1846	
	William Pearce	ditto	5 July 1858	
	William Lewis Cockram Adey	ditto	5 July "	Non-acting on bench.
	George Belben	Mill Owner	11 July 1862	
	George Robert Permyer	Merchant	11 July "	
	Francis Tunewell Rogers	Gentleman	28 Jan. 1865	Acting.
	Thomas Richard Sanders	Manufacturer	28 Jan. "	
	Charles John Stone	Retired Merchant	29 Oct. 1866	
	Martin Kemp Welch	Retired Solicitor	14 Oct. 1873	
	Thomas Belben	Mill Owner	14 Oct. "	
	Heber Dowling Ellis	Surgeon	14 Oct. "	
	Alfred Balston	Manufacturer	14 Oct. "	
	George Hancock Gutch	Gentleman	11 Jan. 1875	
	William Douglas Dugdale	ditto	11 Jan. "	
	John Barnes Dorrell	ditto	11 Jan. "	
	Thomas William Green	ditto	11 Jan. "	
	Thomas Slade, jun.	Retired Merchant	11 Jan. "	Not qualified. Acting.
Portsmouth	George Gillman	Banker	1842.	Resides out of the borough, but attends the bench.
	Bonham William Carter	Esquire	1845	
	Andrew Nance	Yeoman	1845.	
	William Hawkins Ganington	Surgeon	1857.	
	Thomas Robert M'Coy	Retired Captain, Army	1858.	
	James Goldsmith	Yeoman	1858.	
	William Grant Chambers	Retired Grocer	1865.	
	Edward Martin Wells	Maltster	1867.	
	George Curtis	Corn Merchant	1867.	
	John William Moore Miller	Physician	1867.	
	Emanuel Emanuel	Retired Goldsmith	1867.	Carries on business in the borough, but resides out of it; attends the bench.
	Robert Edmund Davies	Draper	1868.	
	Thomas Hodgkinson	Retired Captain, R. N.	1868.	
	Edmund Kent Parson	Surgeon	1869.	
	George Sheppard	Bootmaker	1870.	
	John Baker	Outfitter	1872.	
	Samuel Greetham	Retired Clerk to Justices	1872.	
	George Edward Kent	Yeoman	1874.	
	George Gardiner Alexander	Retired Major General, R. M. A.	1874.	
	William Grant	Banker	1874.	
Preston	Richard Pedder	Esquire	March 1847.	Non-acting.
	William Birley	ditto	Nov. "	
	William Ormerod Pilkington	ditto	July 1857	
	George Sidgreaves	ditto	July "	Non-resident.
	William Humber	ditto	Jan. 1863	
	Edward Rodgett	Manufacturer	April "	
	Daniel Arkwright	Cotton Spinner	May "	Non-acting.
	Charles Roger Jacson	Esquire	Nov. 1866.	
	Joseph Pyke	ditto	Nov. "	
	Edmund Birley	ditto	Sept. 1868.	Non-resident.
	Adam Leigh	Cotton Manufacturer	Sept. "	
	John Walker	Esquire	Sept. "	
	Robert Benson	ditto	Sept. 1869.	
	Spencer Leese	ditto	Sept. "	
	Edward Pyke	ditto	Sept. "	
	William Philip Park	Civil Engineer	Aug. 1873.	
	David Irvin	Merchant	Aug. "	
	Jonathan Sellers	ditto	Aug. "	
	John Satterthwaite	Leather Merchant	Aug. "	
	Moses Savery Maynard	Cotton Spinner	Aug. "	
	John Haslam	ditto	Aug. "	
	Edward Hollins	Manufacturer	Dec. 1855	Non-resident.
	Henry Newsham Pedder	Esquire	May 1858	
	Joseph Hawkins	Cotton Spinner	Aug. 1873	
	James Hogg	Esquire	Sept. 1869	

* As the Commission of the Peace gives no dates they cannot be given more accurately, being interlined from time to time without regard to time of appointment.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Reading - - -	William Silver Darter - -	Gentleman - - -	Jan. 1854.	Almost always non-resident, and has not acted for upwards of a year.
	Charles James Andrewes - -	Ironfounder - - -	Mar. 1861.	
	George Palmer - - -	Biscuit Manufacturer - -	Mar. "	
	Alexander Thwaites - - -	Gentleman - - -	Mar. "	
	Richard Thomas Woodhouse -	Doctor of Medicine - -	Mar. "	
	Timothy Lorkin Walford -	Surgeon - - -	Mar. "	
	William Exall - - -	Civil Engineer - - -	Mar. 1866.	
	Sir Peter Spokes - - -	Knight - - -	Qualified January 1872; appointed about two months previously.	
	Robert Nalder Clarke - -	Gentleman (Barrister-at-Law of the Middle Temple, not in practice), late a territorial magistrate of the Colony of Victoria.	April 1873.	
	James Boorne - - -	Ironmonger - - -	April "	
Reigate - - -	John Talwin Morris - - -	Woollen Draper - - -	April "	No.
	Charles Stephens - - -	Banker - - -	April "	
	John Okey Taylor - - -	Gentleman - - -	April "	
	Walter Blanford Waterlow -	Law Stationer and Printer -	Aug. 1869 -	
	Philip Hanbury - - -	Banker - - -	Aug. " -	
	George Baker - - -	Gentleman - - -	Aug. " -	
Richmond - - -	Constantine Holman - - -	Doctor of Medicine - -	Aug. " -	All the magistrates are both resident and acting.
	Henry Lainson - - -	Gentleman - - -	Aug. " -	
	Sir Valentine Fleming - -	Knight, late Chief Justice of Tasmania.	Jan. 1875 -	
	George Roper - - -	Banker - - -	1866.	
	Edward Wood - - -	Draper - - -	1866.	
	John Godfrey Croft - - -	Wine Merchant - - -	1870.	
Ripon - - -	James Robinson - - -	Draper - - -	1871.	All the magistrates are both resident and acting.
	Richard Atkinson - - -	Surgeon - - -	1871.	
	Richard Bones - - -	- ditto - - -	1874.	
	Richard Lumley (Mayor) -	Common Brewer - - -	Appointed Mayor on the 9th Nov. 1874.	
	William Thompson (ex-Mayor).	Ironmonger - - -	Appointed Mayor on the 9th Nov. 1873.	
	Henry Morton - - -	Esquire - - -	23 Sept. 1854.	
Rochdale - - -	William Yorke - - -	Gentleman - - -	23 Sept. "	All these gentlemen are residents of, and take an active part in, the administration of justice in and for the borough of Rochdale, with the exception of John Tatham, Esq., who has never yet acted in the capacity of magistrate.
	Robert Kearsley - - -	Esquire - - -	1858 -	
	Thomas Kendall - - -	- ditto - - -	23 Sept. 1858.	
	Thomas Carter - - -	Mercer - - -	- Feb. 1868.	
	George Jackson - - -	Currier - - -	- Feb. "	
	William Fenton Kenny -	Esquire - - -	- Feb. "	
	Thomas Judson - - -	Chemist - - -	- Feb. "	
	Edmund Ashworth - - -	Woollen Manufacturer -	20 Sept. 1872	
	George Leach Ashworth (dead)	- - -	20 Sept. "	
	John Robinson - - -	Machinist - - -	20 Sept. "	
	James Brierley - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	20 Sept. "	
	James Butterworth - - -	Gentleman - - -	20 Sept. "	
	Robert Taylor Heape - -	Woolstapler - - -	20 Sept. "	
	William Whitworth Schofield (dead).	- - -	20 Sept. "	
	Clement Molynaux Royds -	Banker - - -	20 Sept. "	
	Richard Hurst - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	20 Sept. "	
	Robert Leach Tweedale -	Woollen Manufacturer -	20 Sept. "	
	Jonathan Nield - - -	Banker - - -	20 Sept. "	
	William Tuer Shawcross -	Cotton Spinner - - -	20 Sept. "	
	Robert Jewison - - -	Tallow Chandler - - -	- Feb. 1874	
	James Petrie - - -	Ironfounder - - -	- Feb. "	
	Thomas Booth - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	- Feb. "	
	Thomas Healey - - -	- ditto - - -	- Feb. "	
	Henry Fishwick - - -	Gentleman - - -	- May "	
	John Leach - - -	Machinist - - -	- May "	
	Charles Whitaker - - -	Cotton Spinner - - -	- Feb. "	
	John Tatham - - -	Ironfounder - - -	- Feb. "	
	Edmund Albert Nuttall Royds	Gentleman - - -	- Mar. 1857	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Rochester, City	Lewis Levy (Mayor, <i>ex officio</i>)	-	-	All resident, and capable of acting.
	Francis Barrow (Recorder, <i>ex officio</i>)	-	-	
	James Latchford Edwards (late Mayor, <i>ex officio</i>)	-	-	
	Edward Robert Coles	Coal Factor	21 Dec. 1850	
	Stephen Steele	Surgeon	21 Dec. "	
	William Manclark	None	29 May 1852	
	George Essell *	Solicitor	29 May "	
	Frederick Furrell	Coal Merchant	1 Jan. 1859	
	Henry Everest	None	21 April 1860	
	George Lowrey	None	21 April "	
	Francis Matthew Webb	None	24 May 1864	
	William Bell	Surgeon	24 May "	
	William Patten Haymen	Coal Factor	16 Mar. 1867	
	Edwin Bridge	None	10 June 1871	
	John Ross Foord	Builder	3 April 1869	
Romsey	James Gouge Maylar	- ditto	10 June 1871	Non-resident; has not acted for many years. Non-resident, and non-acting for upwards of a year. Disqualified in consequence of an arrangement with his creditors.
	Daniel McCoy	Retired Major in the Army.	25 July 1874	
	Humphrey Joseph Hare	Timber Merchant	25 July "	
	William Homan	Draper	25 July "	
	George Sharp	Merchant	14 Dec. 1858	
	Henry Sainsbury	Esquire	1869	
	William Overbury Purchase	- ditto	1869.	
	Charles Dyett	- ditto	1869.	
	William Bentley George	Gentleman	1869.	
	William Henry Slater	- ditto	1869	
Rye	Walter Edmondbury Godfrey	- ditto	1859.	Non-acting. Acting. Non-resident. Acting. Non-acting.
	Charles Fluder Smith (Mayor)	Woolstapler	9 Nov. 1874.	
	Edward Henry Sladen Banks	Esquire	13 April 1854	
	James Foulis Plomley	Chemist	24 June 1858	
	Robert Coker Nash Davies	Surgeon	-	
	William MacDiarmid	Gentleman	8 July 1858	
	George Henry Edwards	- ditto	7 Nov. 1860	
	Charles Pix Meryon	Banker	23 Dec. 1868	
	Thomas Stonham	Grocer	23 Dec. "	
	Henry Burra	Banker	20 Aug. 1873	
Saffron Walden	Thomas Hinds	Merchant	20 Aug. "	All resident, and acting. Retains office as Justice of the Peace up to November 1876.
	George Gibbs Edwards	Draper	20 Aug. "	
	Edward Barrett Curteis	Esquire	15 Jan. 1849	
	Alfred Nicholas Jones	Surgeon	9 Nov. 1864	
	Joshua Clarke	Maltster	14 Jan. 1870	
	John Green Emson	Wholesale Grocer	14 Jan. "	
	George Stacey Gibson	Banker	8 Dec. 1873	
	Benjamin Tomson Thurgood (Mayor).	Estate Agent	9 Nov. 1874	
	Philip Inglis Page	Auctioneer, &c.	8 Dec. 1858	
	Thomas Kinder	Gentleman	8 Dec. "	
St. Albans	John Thomas Nicholson Lipscomb.	Doctor of Medicine	8 Dec. "	Non-resident, and non-acting for several years. Non-resident, but usually acts. Resident, and acting. Non-resident, and non-acting for several years. Resident, and acting. Non-resident, and non-acting for several years. Resident, and acting. Non-resident, but usually acts. Resident, and acting.
	Charles Augustus Thorne	Gentleman	8 Dec. "	
	Charles Woollam	Silk Manufacturer	31 Dec. 1870	
	William Bradley	Gentleman	31 Dec. "	
	Edward Sutton Wiles	Tallow Chandler	12 Nov. 1873	
	Henry Joseph Toulmin	Gentleman	12 Nov. "	
	Charles Kempe Dyer	- ditto	12 Nov. "	
	Francis Joseph Searancke (ex-Mayor).	- ditto	9 Nov. "	
	Sidney Longhurst Harding (Mayor).	Auctioneer	9 Nov. 1874	
	James John Gape	Gentleman	31 Dec. 1870	

* Mr. Essell does not perform any magisterial duties now.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
St. Ives* - - -	Read Adams (Mayor) - - -	Merchant - - -	1874.	
Salford - - -	Richard Harwood (Mayor) - -	- - -	24 May 1869	No.
	William Agnew - - -	Gentleman - - -	3 Aug. "	
	Elkanah Armitage - - -	- ditto - - -	24 May "	
	James Lomax Barrett - - -	- ditto - - -	6 July 1874	No.
	Charles Edvard Cawley - -	Member of Parliament -	21 Sept. 1870	
	Charles Leigh Clare - - -	Gentleman - - -	27 May 1869	
	Thomas Davies - - -	- ditto - - -	21 Sept. 1870	Non-resident.
	Samuel Dewhurst - - -	- ditto - - -	21 Sept. "	
	W. Whitelegge Goulden - -	- ditto - - -	6 July 1874	
	James Leeming - - -	- ditto - - -	21 Sept. 1870	No.
	William Wilkinson Platt - -	- ditto - - -	21 Sept. "	
	Richard Radford - - -	- ditto - - -	20 Aug. 1874	
	George Robinson - - -	- ditto - - -	6 July "	No.
	Nathaniel Shelmerdine - -	- ditto - - -	21 Sept. 1870	
	Wright Turner - - -	- ditto - - -	23 Aug. 1869	
Sandwich - - -	John Tysoe - - -	- ditto - - -	13 April 1874	No.
	J. J. Wood - - -	- ditto - - -	6 July "	
	Richard Harrison, sen. - -	Gentleman - - -	1837 - - -	No.
	Richard Marsh - - -	Grazier - - -	1858 - - -	
	John Christopher Drayson - -	Gentleman - - -	1864 - - -	
	Robert Lough Harrison - -	- ditto - - -	1864 - - -	
	James Dorman - - -	- ditto - - -	1867 - - -	
	Richard Harrison, jun. - -	- ditto - - -	1872 - - -	
	George Coleman - - -	- ditto - - -	1872 - - -	
Scarborough - - -	The Mayor for the time being.			Non-resident.
	The Ex-Mayor for the time being.			
	The Recorder for the time being.			
	Samuel Standridge Byron - -	Esquire - - -	† 5 July 1837	Non-resident.
	John Wharton - - -	- ditto - - -	31 Oct. 1842	
	Henry Thomas Laye - - -	- ditto - - -	16 Oct. 1858	
	Robert Champley - - -	- ditto - - -	31 Dec. 1864	Resident.
	William Holden - - -	- ditto - - -	25 Mar. 1865	
	John Leckenby - - -	- ditto - - -	27 July 1866	
	Richard Cross - - -	Doctor of Medicine - -	27 July "	Resident.
	John Fairgray Sharpin - -	Wine and Spirit Merchant	26 July 1867	
	William F. Rooke - - -	Doctor of Medicine - -	26 July "	
	William Hebden - - -	Banker - - -	Not yet qualified	Resident.
	Hodgson Smith - - -	Shipowner - - -	28 Dec. 1868	
	William Taylor - - -	Surgeon - - -	9 July 1869	
	William Inglis - - -	Esquire - - -	28 Dec. 1868	Resident.
	Honourable F. Stuart Wortley		20 April 1874	
	William Rowntree - - -	Draper - - -	27 April "	
	Robert Forster - - -	Grocer - - -	20 April "	Resident.
	Zachariah Tranmar Wellburn	Esquire - - -	6 July "	
	Arthur Duncombe - - -	- ditto - - -	6 July "	
	John Kitchin - - -	- ditto - - -	6 July "	
Sheffield - - -	Richard Bayley - - -	Out of business - - -	4 Dec. 1848	Non-acting.
	Edward Vickers - - -	- ditto - - -	4 Dec. "	Non-resident.
	Samuel Roberts - - -	- ditto - - -	4 Dec. "	Non-acting.
	John Bower Brown - - -	- ditto - - -	4 Dec. "	
	John Jobson Smith - - -	Manufacturer - - -	4 Dec. "	
	Sir John Brown - - -	Knight - - -	- July 1863.	Non-acting.
	Henry Harrison - - -	Merchant and Manufac- turer.	- July "	
	William Fisher - - -	- ditto - - -	- July "	
	Henry Elliott Hoole - - -	- ditto - - -	- July "	Declined to qualify.
	Henry Wilson - - -	Snuff Manufacturer - -	- July "	
	Thomas Jessop - - -	Steel Manufacturer - -	- July "	
	Mark Firth - - -	- ditto - - -	24 Mar. 1870.	Non-acting.
	Frederick Thorpe Mappin - -	- ditto - - -	24 Mar. "	
	William Edward Laycock - -	Hair Seating Manufacturer	24 Mar. "	
	William Kirkby Pearce - -	Manufacturer - - -	24 Mar. "	Non-acting.
	George Wostenholme - - -	- ditto - - -	24 Mar. "	

* No other magistrate within the Borough besides the Mayor, who is the Justice of the Peace during his term.

† These dates given are the dates of qualification, not the dates of appointment.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Sheffield—continued	Joseph Hallam	Needle Manufacturer	30 April 1874.	Has not qualified.
	Thomas Edward Vickers	Steel Manufacturer	30 April "	
	Henry Isaac Dixon	Manufacturer	30 April "	
	Henry Unwin	Out of business	30 April "	
	Henry Stephenson	Type Founder	30 April "	
	Samuel Roberts	Silver Plate Manufacturer	30 April "	
	Thomas Austin Sorby	Manufacturer	30 April "	
	Frederick Bardwell	Out of business	30 April "	
	Thomas William Rodgers	Barrister-at-Law	30 April "	
	Charles Atkinson	Out of business	30 April "	
	William Greaves Blake	ditto	30 April "	
	William Gainsford	Colliery Proprietor	30 April "	
	Edward Montague Earle Welby.	Barrister-at-Law (Stipendiary Magistrate).	22 April "	
Shrewsbury	The Mayor for the time being.			Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	John Walton	Gentleman		
	Humphrey Sandford	Esquire		Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Samuel Smith	Gentleman		
	Thomas Pidduck	Surgeon		Appointed prior to the 7th March 1867, when a new Commission was granted.
	John Thomas Nightingale	Gentleman		
	John Robert Humphreys	Surgeon		7 Mar. 1867.
	James Bratton	ditto		
	Robert Henry Lingen Burton	Esquire and Banker	7 Mar. 1867.	
	Samuel Wood	Surgeon	7 Mar. "	
	Thomas Groves	Builder	7 Mar. "	
	John Watton	Newspaper Proprietor	7 Mar. "	
	Andrew Good Brookes	Surgeon	— Feb. 1874.	
	John Loxdale	Esquire	— Feb. "	
	John Bagnall	Grocer	— Feb. "	
	Samuel Pountney Smith	Architect	— Feb. "	
Southampton	Joseph Lobb	Gentleman	6 Dec. 1837	
	Joseph Bernard	ditto	15 Jan. 1841	Has acted.
	George Atherley	Banker	24 Feb. 1848	
	Edward Lomer	Gentleman	21 June 1858	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	John Richard King	Brewer	22 June "	
	John Ralph Engledue	Gentleman	2 Aug. "	Has acted.
	Richard Coles	Merchant	10 Aug. 1861	
	Charles Arthur Day (described in commission Charles Day).	Iron Ship Builder	10 Aug. "	Non-acting.
	William Sharland	Bookseller	10 Aug. "	Has acted.
	William Brodribb Randall	Chemist	10 Aug. "	
	John Henry Cooksey	Provision Merchant	10 Aug. "	
	Senerus William Linum Stretton.	Colonel	25 Sept. "	
	Edward Dixon	Merchant	14 Nov. "	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Thomas Hill	Shipping Agent	14 Nov. "	Has acted.
	Samuel Tryon	Major General	11 June 1864	
	Frederick Perkins, Knight	Wine and Spirit Merchant	15 June "	
	Andrew Lamb	Gentleman	21 Dec. 1866	Non-acting for upwards of a year, but has been in constant attendance since the 15th day of April 1875.
	Edward Mayes	Silk Mercer and Draper	21 Dec. "	Has acted.
	William Vincent	Gentleman	21 Dec. "	Non-acting.
	George Dunlop	Shipping Agent	21 Dec. "	Has acted.
	Samuel Michael Emanuel	Gentleman	5 Feb. 1867	
	Edwin Hearne	Doctor of Physic	14 Oct. 1869	
	James Cocks	Outfitter	26 Oct. "	
	Henry Joseph Buchan	House Decorator	10 Nov. "	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Southampton—cont ^d -	Edwin Jones - - - -	Silk Mercer and Draper -	4 Mar. 1872	Has acted.
	William Furber - - - -	Auctioneer - - - -	4 Mar. „	
	Alfred Pegler - - - -	Watchmaker and Jeweller -	5 Mar. „	
	William Gordon - - - -	Sail Maker - - - -	3 Mar. 1874	
	John Traffells Tucker - - - -	Estate Agent - - - -	3 Mar. „	
	George Pardey Perkins - - - -	Timber Merchant - - - -	3 Mar. „	
	William Henry Rogers - - - -	Florist - - - -	4 Mar. „	
	David Davis - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	4 Mar. „	
	The Mayor, George Mason Passenger (<i>ex officio</i>). Edwin Jones (late Mayor, <i>ex officio</i> , being the above-named Edwin Jones).	Merchant - - - - Silk Mercer and Draper -	9 Nov. „ 10 Nov. 1873	
South Molton - - -	The Right Hon. Hugh Earl Fortescue.	- - - -	24 Oct. 1843	Non-resident.
	William Binford - - - -	Esquire - - - -	24 Oct. „	Blind, and not acting for upwards of a year.
	Joshua Bawden - - - -	Clerk in Holy Orders -	- June 1861.	Non-resident.
	Francis Maunder Hitchcock -	Woollen Manufacturer -	- June „	
	William Gould Smyth - - - -	Tanner - - - -	- June „	
	Richard Bury Russell - - - -	Banker - - - -	- June 1868.	Non-resident.
	John Longworth Danes - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	- June „	
	John Cook, jun. - - - -	Builder - - - -	- June „	
	Richard Sey - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	- June „	
	Narcissus Collins Hatherly -	Doctor of Medicine -	- Oct. „	
	John White - - - -	Draper - - - -	- Jan. 1874.	
	Robert Tanner (Mayor) - - -	Wine Merchant and Grocer	- Nov. „	
South Shields - - -	James Young - - - -	Shipowner - - - -	11 July 1851.	Non-acting.
	John Robinson - - - -	- ditto - - - -	11 July „	
	Jerrot Glover - - - -	Auctioneer - - - -	11 July „	
	John Williamson - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	11 July „	
	John B. Dale - - - -	Banker - - - -	11 July „	
	William James - - - -	Shipowner - - - -	1865.	
	John L. Hall - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1865.	
	William Black - - - -	Alkali Manufacturer -	1865.	Non-acting.
	James C. Stevenson - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1865.	
	George D. Mease - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1865.	
	Edward Moore - - - -	Glass Manufacturer -	23 May 1873.	
	Archibald Stevenson - - - -	- ditto - - - -	23 May „	
	Henry Nelson - - - -	Shipowner - - - -	23 May „	
	John Broughton - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	23 May „	
	John Strachan - - - -	Auctioneer - - - -	23 May „	
Southwold - - -	John Eustan Grubbe - - - -	Barrister (not in practice as such now), Parliamen- tary Agent.	* 1854 or 1855.	
	Edward Ralph Blackett - - -	M. D. - - - -	* 1862.	
	Francis Henry Vertue - - - -	Surgeon - - - -	* 1866.	
	Charles Foster - - - -	Solicitor - - - -	* 1868.	
Stafford - - -	Edwin Bestock - - - -	Shoe Manufacturer - - -	29 Dec. 1851	Non-acting.
	William Jones - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	- Jan. 1857.	
	John Lea - - - -	Shoe Manufacturer - - -	7 Jan. 1864.	
	William Buxton - - - -	Merchant - - - -	7 Jan. „	
	John Talbot - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	7 Jan. „	
	William Sylvester - - - -	Merchant - - - -	7 Jan. „	
	Edward Mousley - - - -	Grocer - - - -	5 April 1867	Non-resident, and non- acting.
	Thomas Turner - - - -	Ironmonger - - - -	5 April „	
	Hugh Woods Gibson - - - -	Shoe Manufacturer - - -	5 April „	
	Edward Lloyd - - - -	- ditto - - - -	1 Feb. 1875.	
	Bateman Perkins Wright - - -	- ditto - - - -	1 Feb. „	
	John Shallcross - - - -	Gentleman - - - -	1 Feb. „	

* The Commission does not give the date of the appointment; the exact date therefore is not known.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Stafford—continued	William Francis Woolley	Gentleman	1 Feb. 1875.	
	Henry Woodhouse	Civil Engineer	1 Feb. „	
	Henry Gillard	Auctioneer and Estate Agent.	1 Feb. „	
	James Cramer Marson	Grocer	1 Feb. „	
Stalybridge	Robert Stanley (Mayor)	Wholesale Grocer	1867.	
	William Bayley	Retired Cotton Manufacturer.	1859	Non-acting.
	Thomas Harrison	Barrister-at-Law	1859.	
	Henry Bayley	Cotton Manufacturer	1859	Non-acting.
	Robert Hopwood	Doctor of Medicine	1859.	
	John Pearson	Surgeon	1859	Resident out, but within seven miles of the borough.
	James Buckley	Corn Miller	1859	Not qualified.
	Walter Sidebottom	Cotton Spinner	1859	Died 11 Mar. 1875.
	Ralph Bates	ditto	1859.	
	Randal Ridgway	Yeoman	1859.	
	John Marsland	Retired Cotton Spinner	1859.	
	Moses Hadfield	Yeoman	1859.	
	Thomas Fernibough	Leather Currier	1867.	
	John Hyde	Cotton Spinner	1867.	
	John Frederick Cheetham	Cotton Manufacturer	1869	Not qualified.
	Thomas Bayley	ditto	1869.	
	James Kirk	Coal Merchant	1869	Non-resident.
	Ralph Ashton	Retired Grocer	1874.	
	Willam Storrs	Builder	1874.	
	Robert Broadbent	Machine Maker	1874.	
	Frederick John Roberts-Dudley	Surgeon	1874.	
	Joseph Donnell the younger	Cotton Spinner	1874.	
Stamford	John Rove Lowe	Mayor	—	
	Thomas Gurney Mason	Ex-mayor	—	
	John Paradise	Editor	9 April 1862.	
	William E. Robbs, M.B.	Surgeon	5 Nov. 1866.	
	William Newman, M.D.	ditto	5 Nov. „	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Henry Johnson	Stationer	5 Nov. „	
	George Baker	Gentleman	24 July 1869	
	Henry Michelson	Ironmonger	26 Oct. 1872.	
	George Patterson	Chemist	26 Oct. „	
	Charles Healey	Gentleman	26 Oct. „	
Stockport	Charles Baker	Esquire	2 Sept. 1840	
	Richard Sykes	Bleacher	16 Nov. „	Resident, and acting.
	Samuel Ratchiffe Carrington	Hat Manufacturer	— Aug. 1848	
	Joseph St. John Yates	County Court Judge	16 Nov. „	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	George Turner	Doctor of Medicine	— Aug. 1852	
	William Ravner	ditto	— June 1855	
	William Williamson	Ironfounder	— Mar. 1861	
	George Chapman	Draper	— Mar. „	
	Robert M'Clure	Cotton Spinner	— Nov. 1864	
	Edward Walmsley	ditto	— Nov. „	
	Ephraim Hullam	ditto	— Nov. „	
	George Arthur Fernley	ditto	— Dec. 1866	
	Samuel Wright Wilkinson	ditto	— Dec. „	
	Cephas John Howard	Esquire	— Dec. „	
	Wakefield Christy	Hat Manufacturer	— Dec. „	
	Edmund Howard Sykes	Bleacher	— Dec. „	
	George Downs	Doctor of Medicine	— Dec. „	
	Henry Heginbotham	Surgeon	8 May 1868	
	James Smith	Wholesale Grocer	8 May „	
	Alexander Henry Shaw	Esquire	8 May „	
	George Wild	Boot Manufacturer	— Dec. 1873	
	John Walthew	Cotton Spinner	— Dec. „	
	William Cinton Eskrigge	ditto	— Dec. „	
	Stephen Christy	Hat Manufacturer	— Nov. 1874	
	Arthur Howard Sykes	Bleacher	— Nov. „	Resident, and acting.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Stockton-on-Tees	Charles Trotter	Doctor of Physic	—	Non-resident.
	Peter Romyn	Merchant	—	
	Richard Ord, jun.	Currier	1862.	
	William Benington	Wholesale Grocer	1862.	
	Anthony Crosby Knowles	ditto	1867.	
	John Hansell Wren	Corn Merchant	1867.	
	Richard Jackson	Currier	1867.	
	George Lockwood	Iron Shipbuilder	1867.	
	William Bolam Brayshay	Druggist	Sept. 1874.	
	Joshua Stagg Byers	Timber Merchant	Sept. "	
	John Dale	Surgeon	Sept. "	
	Edward Henderson	Draper	Sept. "	
Stratford-upon-Avon	Henry Kingsley	Doctor in Medicine	Nov. 1856	No.
	Frederick Kendall	Gentleman	Nov. "	
	James Cox the younger	Timber Merchant	May 1870	
Sudbury	William Bestoe Smith	Surgeon	1 Nov. 1837	Resides in the borough.
	William Robert Bevan	Banker	1 Nov. "	Resides within 15 miles.
	George Mumford	Esquire	Feb. 1867	Resides within three miles.
	George David Badham	ditto	Feb. "	
	Samuel Higgs	Merchant	Feb. "	Resides within two miles.
	John Bridgman	Draper	Feb. "	Resides within one mile.
Sunderland	James Hartley	Gentleman	1841.	Not acting.
	George Hudson	ditto	1841	
	Jaimes Laing	Shipbuilder	1853.	
	Samuel Alcock	Gentleman	1853.	Non-resident.
	Edward Temperley Gourley, M.P.	Shipowner	1866.	
	Robert Elwin	Gentleman	1866.	
	John Thomas Alcock	ditto	1866	Not acting.
	John James Kayll	Glass Manufacturer	1866.	
	William Nicholson	Shipowner	1866.	
	William Stobart	Coalowner	1866	Has not been sworn in.
	William Thompson	Shipowner	1870.	
	Ralph Milbank Hudson	ditto	1870.	
	Henry Overend Bowman	Doctor of Medicine	1870.	Sworn in on the 6th March 1875.
	George Robert Booth	Shipowner	1870.	
	Thomas Reed	Bookseller	1870	
	John Potts	Surgeon	1870.	Non-resident.
	Andrew Common	Bank Manager	1870.	
	Alexander Gordon M'Kenzie	Draper	Jan. 1875	
	John Crozier	Gentleman	Jan. "	Non-resident.
	Thomas Thompson Pyle	Doctor of Medicine	Jan. "	
	John Nicholson	Shipowner	Jan. "	
	Joseph Norman Wilson	ditto	Jan. "	Non-resident.
	Martin Wiener	Merchant and Shipowner	Jan. "	
	John Kidson	Gentleman	Jan. "	
	Francis Ritson	Shipowner	Jan. "	
Swansea	Frank Ash Yeo	Mayor of Swansea	1874.	Non-resident.
	John C. Fowler	Stipendiary Magistrate	1872.	
	Thomas Powell	Ex-Mayor of Swansea	1874.	
	Starling Benson	Esquire	1855.	
	James Walters	ditto	1855.	
	George Grant Francis	ditto	1855.	
	Evan M. Richards	ditto	1855.	
	John Williams James	ditto	1855.	
	John Biddulph	ditto	1857.	
	Trevor A. Williams	ditto	1859.	
	Silvanus Padlen	ditto	1859.	
	John C. Richardson	ditto	1859.	
	John Oakshot	ditto	1859.	
	W. H. Michael	Barrister-at-Law	1860	
	J. Clarke Richardson	Esquire	1868.	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Swansea—continued	G. B. Brock	Esquire	1868.	Non-resident.
	Sydney Hall	ditto	1868	
	W. H. Forester	Merchant	1868.	
	T. Phillips	Esquire	1868.	
	J. Trer Jenkins	ditto	1868.	
	John Jones Jenkins	ditto	1874.	
	John Glasbrook	ditto	1874.	
	Thomas Cory	ditto	1874.	
	James Rogers	Surgeon	1874.	
	Thomas Ford	Merchant	1874.	
	Richard Hughes	Esquire	1874.	
Tamworth	Thomas Bramall	Esquire	15 Nov. 1837.	
	Francis Willington	ditto	15 Nov. "	
	Frederic Ruffe	Surgeon	April 1870.	
	Isaac Bradbury	Gentleman	1 Jan. 1874.	
	John Bailey (Mayor)	Ironmonger	9 Nov. "	
	Peter Aitken (ex-Mayor)	Draper	9 Nov. 1873.	
Tenby	Randle Wilbraham Falconer	Doctor of Medicine	4 Mar. 1845	Non-resident.
	Henry Sanders	Esquire	20 Aug. 1852	Non-acting.
	Nicholas John Dunn	ditto	10 Dec. 1858	Non-resident.
	Charles Cook Wells	ditto	10 Dec. "	Non-resident.
	John Maule Sutton	Doctor of Medicine	10 Dec. "	
	Frederic Daniel Dyster	ditto	10 Dec. 1866.	Non-resident.
	George White	Wine Merchant	26 Dec. "	
	William Rees	Retired Captain in the Merchant Service.	31 May 1867.	
	Edward Rawdon Bingham Power.	Esquire	22 Nov. 1872.	
Tenterden	Seaman Beale	Gentleman	14 May 1855.	Died 18th May 1875.
	John Hope	ditto	14 May "	
	John Ellis Mace	ditto	14 May "	
	Samuel Boorman	ditto	3 Sept. "	
	Francis Russell (Recorder)	Barrister	17 Oct. 1859.	
	Virgil Pomfret	Gentleman	7 Oct. 1836	
	Matthew Rogers (Mayor)	Farmer and Grazier	9 Nov. 1874.	
	Joseph Munn (ex-officio Mayor)	Solicitor	10 Nov. 1873.	
Tewkesbury	James Francis Prosser (Mayor)	Gentleman.		Non-acting.
	Samuel Healing	Miller and Maltster	23 Mar. 1855	
	George Ruddle	Esquire	21 Dec. 1841	
	Robert Bolding	Gentleman	13 July 1858.	
	Daniel Devereux	Surgeon	27 July 1868.	
	B. T. Moore	Auctioneer	28 Nov. 1866.	
	N. N. Dyer	Esquire	27 July 1868.	
	J. Surman	ditto	27 July "	
	W. H. Peacey	Surgeon	4 May 1866.	
	J. H. Boughton	ditto	4 May "	
	William Allard	ditto	28 Nov. "	Non-resident.
	James Fallon (Recorder) ex-officio.	Barrister-at-Law	-	
Thetford	James Cronshey	Maltster and Merchant	*— July 1860.	
	Cornell Henry Fison	ditto	— July "	
	William Peehey	ditto	15 Dec. 1872.	
	George Augustus Marsham, Esq.	Major, Norfolk Militia	15 Dec. "	
	Charles Burrell	Engineer	15 Dec. "	
Tiverton	Thomas Carew	Esquire	9 May 1851.	Non-resident.
	William Northrow	ditto	9 May "	
	William Hornsey Gamlen	ditto	9 May "	
	Sir John Heathcoat Heathcoat Amory.	Baronet	31 Dec. 1855.	
	John Francis Worth	Esquire	31 Dec. "	
	George Patterson	Doctor of Medicine	9 May 1851	Non-resident.

* The exact date cannot be furnished, as the Lord Chancellor retained the Commission of the Peace, and issued a new one in its stead when the last appointment of Justices took place in December 1870.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Tiverton—continued	William Henry Dunsford	Esquire	15 Mar. 1861.	
	Samuel Gath	- ditto -	15 Mar. "	
	Frederic Mackenzie	Surgeon	15 Mar. "	
	Frederick Owen Patch	Esquire	1867.	
	Henry Septimus Gill	- ditto -	1867.	
	Frederick Shorland Gervis	Surgeon	1867.	
	John Lane	Esquire	1867.	
	John Wills	- ditto -	2 April 1874.	
	John Amory Travers	- ditto -	2 April "	
	Edward Hallam	- ditto -	2 April "	
	William Cowper Ludovic Unwin.	- ditto -	2 April "	
	George Woodbury Cockram (Mayor).	- - -	9 Nov. "	
Totnes	Charles Webber	Retired Mercer and Draper	20 Nov. 1837	Nearly 80 years old; non-resident, non-acting, since May 1874; not in health to attend again it is said.
	S. E. Cary	Esquire	No entry in the Council books.	Not accepted office.
	John Webber Chaster	Gentleman	6 April 1864.	
	Samuel Huxham	- ditto -	7 Jan. 1865.	
	John Bowden	Merchant	1 June 1869	
	Samuel Brooking Dolling	Captain, R.N.	1 June "	Arranged with creditors in Bankruptcy in 1870, and again in 1873; not yet clear of liabilities.
	Lewis John Oldrieve	- - -	In 1872, qualified at the County Assizes in 1873.	
	John Hains	Doctor of Medicine	- - -	
	Richard Cranch Paige	Gentleman	- - -	
	James Westhead	Esquire	- - -	
	Andrew Sparke Distin	Ironmonger	- - -	
	Albert James Wallis	Surgeon	- - -	
Truro	Edward Michell	Merchant	*17 Dec. 1856	No.
	Charles Barham	Doctor of Medicine	*17 Dec. "	
	Thomas Truran	Surgeon	*23 April 1864	Non-resident, and non-acting for more than a year.
	Edward Shipheard Carus-Wilson.	Banker	*28 April "	
	Samuel Pascoe	Gentleman	*23 April "	No.
	Thomas Solomon	House Decorator	*27 May 1868	
	George Read	Gentleman	*6 July "	
	Edwin Parkyn	- ditto -	*27 May "	
	George Clyma	- ditto -	*2 Feb. 1869	
	Thomas Chirgwin	Accountant	*20 July 1874	
	William Barrett	Gentleman	*20 July "	Has never taken oath of office or acted.
	William Tweedy	Banker	*- July "	
Tynemouth	Henry Edward Pyler Adamson (Mayor).	Ship Owner	9 Nov. 1874.	
	Robert Watson Surtees (ex-Mayor).	- ditto -	9 Nov. 1873.	
	William Linskill	Esquire	16 Sept. 1850	Non-resident.
	John Coppin	- ditto -	16 Sept. "	Non-acting.
	William Walker	Gentleman	13 May 1857	
	Addison Potter	Coal Owner	13 May "	
	Alexander Shannon Stevenson	Merchant	27 May "	
	Emanuel Young	Ship Builder	22 Feb. 1860.	
	William Bourne	Doctor of Medicine	22 Mar. "	Non-acting.
	John Martin Redmayne	Merchant	22 Mar. "	
	John Foster Spence	Draper	22 Mar. "	
	Joseph Green	- ditto -	26 Dec. 1865.	
	John Byrom Bramwell	Doctor of Medicine	26 Dec. "	
	Jacob Burnett	Merchant	26 Dec. "	
	Joseph Spence	Draper	26 Dec. "	
	Joseph Robinson	Ship Owner	26 Dec. "	
	Edward Shotton	- ditto -	26 Dec. "	

* These dates are not the dates of appointment, but the dates of taking the oath of office.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
* Wakefield - -	William Henry Stewart, Esq. (Mayor).	Solicitor - - - -	Elected Mayor 9 Nov. 1874.	Resident.
	Thomas Wilton Haigh, Esq. (ex-Mayor).	Malster - - - -	Elected Mayor 10 Nov. 1873.	Resides at Sandal; place of business at Wakefield.
	Samuel Whitham, Esq. - -	Ironfounder - - - -	Commissioned 7 March 1870.	Resident.
	Samuel Holdsworth, Esq., M.D.	Physician - - - -	- ditto -	
	Edis Alexander Mackie, Esq.	Corn Merchant - - -	- ditto -	Resides at Heath; business at Wakefield.
	Joseph Rhodes, Esq. - -	Ironfounder - - - -	- ditto -	Resident.
	William Hartley Lee, Esq. -	Worsted Spinner - -	- ditto -	
	William Statter, Esq. - -	Surgeon - - - -	- ditto -	
	Joseph Tolson White, Esq. -	Civil Engineer - - -	- ditto -	Resides at Altofts; business at Wakefield.
	Isaac Briggs, Esq. - -	Worsted Spinner - -	- ditto -	Resides at Sandal; business at Wakefield.
	Samuel Bruce, Esq. - -	Barrister-at-Law - -	- ditto -	Resident.
	Alfred William Stanfield, Esq.	Stationer and Printer -	- ditto -	
	Richard Holdsworth, Esq. -	Outfitter - - - -	- ditto -	
	William Henry Bedford Tomlinson, Esq.	Ironfounder - - - -	- ditto -	Residence at Sandal; business at Wakefield.
† Wallingford - -	William Atkinson - - -	Surgeon - - - -	Feb. 1851 -	Resides three miles from borough.
	William Wright - - -	Gentleman - - - -	Feb. „ -	Resides one mile from borough.
	Charles Greenwood - - -	- ditto - - - -	Dec. 1852 -	Non-acting from age.
	Robert Payne - - -	Grocer and Chemist -	Dec. „ -	
	Henry Hawkins - - -	Draper - - - -	Mar. 1870.	Resides two miles from borough.
	John Henry Spokes - - -	Farmer - - - -	Dec. 1873 -	
Walsall - - -	John Day - - -	Surgeon - - - -	1841.	Non-resident.
	Arthur Adams - - -	Merchant - - - -	1841. - -	
	Charles Haden Adams - -	Gentleman - - - -	Never qualified	
	William Harrison - - -	Coal Master - - - -	1850 - -	
	Samuel Stephens - - -	Merchant - - - -	1850. - -	
	Henry Highway - - -	Chemist and Druggist -	1854.	
	John Shannon - - -	Manchester Warehouseman	1854.	
	John Woodward Newman -	Merchant - - - -	1859.	
	Henry Brace - - -	- ditto - - - -	1859.	
	Stephen Stokes - - -	Tanner - - - -	1859.	
	Peter Potter - - -	Land Agent - - - -	1859.	
	John Brown Anderson - -	Saddlers' Ironmonger -	1859.	
	Charles Eyland - - -	Spectacle Manufacturer -	1859.	
	John Brewer - - -	Timber Merchant - -	1868.	
	Edward Thomas Holden -	Currier - - - -	1872.	
	John Hildick - - -	Provision Dealer - -	1872.	
Warrington - - -	Silvanus Chandley - - -	Painter, &c. - - -	16 Nov. 1874	Resident, and acting.
	John Richard Pickmere -	Wine Merchant - - -	- - -	
	Henry Stanton - - -	Esquire - - - -	23 Feb. 1852	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Benjamin Pierpoint - - -	- ditto - - - -	23 Feb. „	Resident, but non-acting.
	Peter Rylands - - -	Wire Manufacturer - -	23 Feb. „	
	Nathaniel D. Milner - - -	Esquire - - - -	16 Dec. 1858	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	Shaw Thewlis - - -	Tool Manufacturer - -	16 Dec. „	Resident, and acting.
	Thomas Glazebrook Rylands -	Wire Manufacturer - -	16 Dec. „	Non resident, and non-acting.
	George Wilmot Hardy - - -	Surgeon - - - -	16 Dec. „	Resident, and acting.
	Charles Henry Cartwright -	Glass Manufacturer - -	16 Dec. „	
	George Artingstall - - -	Wire, &c., Manufacturer -	27 April 1867	Non-resident, and non-acting.
	John Rylands - - -	Wire Manufacturer - -	27 April „	
	Henry Bleckley - - -	Iron Manufacturer - -	27 April „	Resident, and acting.
	George Crossfield - - -	Soap Manufacturer - -	23 Feb. 1852	Non-resident, and non-acting.

* All the above justices still act for the said borough.

† This return does not include the Mayor and ex-Mayor for the time being, who are justices *ex officio*.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Warrington— <i>contd.</i>	Samuel Rigby	Cotton Manufacturer	26 April 1869	Resident, and acting.
	William Nield	Iron Manufacturer	26 April "	
	Joseph Smith	Surgeon	26 April "	
	Peter Smith	Esquire	20 May 1870	Resident, and acting.
	Charles John Holmes	Tailor and Draper	20 May "	
	John Crosfield	Soap Manufacturer	20 May 1874	
	John G. M'Minnies	Cotton Manufacturer	(Not qualified)	(Not yet qualified).
	Charles Broadbent	Tanner	20 May 1874	Resident, and acting.
	James Hephherd	Maltster	20 July "	
	Sylvanus Reynolds	Tanner	24 July "	
	Joseph Davies	Accountant	20 July "	
Warwick	Thomas Campbell Foster, Esq. (Recorder).	Barrister-at-Law	- Jan. 1875	Non-resident.
	Edward Greaves	Retired Banker	5 May 1858	
	John Moore	Land Agent	5 May "	
	William Smith	Banker	5 May "	
	Edward Dodd	Gentleman	5 May "	
	Kelynge Greenway	Banker	5 May "	
	George Henry Nelson	Gelatine Manufacturer	- Dec. 1870.	Non-acting.
	Thomas Lloyd	Banker	- Dec. "	
	Robert Dymock Vaughton	Captain and Adjutant of Militia.	- Dec. "	
	Alfred Field	Merchant	- Dec. "	
Wells	William Bannister Shaw	Gentleman	- Dec. "	Non-resident. Resident, but has not acted for one year.
	Thomas Greenway (ex-Mayor up to November 1875).	Banker.		
	John Roy Allen	Esquire	14 Nov. 1837	
	Joseph Giles	- ditto	14 Nov. "	
	William Inman Welsh	Solicitor	6 May 1839	
	John Giffard Everett (Mayor)	Merchant	17 April 1858	
	Albion Andrews	Currier	17 April "	
	Henry William Livett	Doctor of Physic	3 Aug. 1868	
	Thomas Purnell	- ditto	3 Aug. "	
	John Gabriel French	Surgeon	3 Aug. "	
Welshpool	Edward Thompson David Harrison.	Surgeon	20 Mar. 1870.	Acting. Non-resident.
	Thomas Brettell Barrett	- ditto	20 Mar. "	
	Samuel Powell	Currier	20 Mar. "	
	William Thomas Parker	Gentleman	20 Mar. "	
	David Pryce Owen	Bookseller	29 June 1874.	
	William Witby	Land Agent	29 June "	
Wenlock	William Penny Brookes	Surgeon	1841	Acting. Non-resident. Acting. Infirm. Acting. Never sworn in. Not sworn in. Acting. Not sworn.
	Andrew Good Brookes	- ditto	25 Nov. 1850	
	John Pritchard	Banker	9 Feb. 1857	
	Henry Dickinson	Ironmaster	1858	
	William Layton Lowndes	Gentleman	1858	
	George Adney	- ditto	1858	
	William Nicholas	Banker	1858	
	Ralph Augustus Benson	Barrister	1866	
	Walter Moseley	Esquire	1866	
	Thomas Instone (late Mayor).	Farmer	1867	
	Richard Taylor Davies (late Mayor).	- ditto	1869	
	George Maw	Encaustic Tile Manufacturer	1869	
	William Gregory Norris	Ironmaster	1869	
	John Arthur Anstice (late Mayor).	- ditto	1869	
	Charles Pugh (late Mayor)	- ditto	1869	
	William Pugh	China Manufacturer	1850	
* Weymouth and Malcombe Regis.	William Eliot	Banker	8 April 1852	Did not qualify. Non-acting for six years. Acting. Non-acting for six years.
	Richard Bowler	Gentleman	8 April "	
	William Scholles Ferris	- ditto	8 April "	
	William Prowse	Commander, R. N.	8 April "	
	Charles Penny	Gentleman	- Aug. 1857	

* Twelve justices acting, inclusive of the Mayor.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Weymouth and Melcombe Regis— <i>continued</i> .	Joseph Ayling	Gentleman	- Aug. 1857	Still acting.
	Edward Bayly	- ditto -	- Aug. "	Non-acting.
	Richard Cotterell	- ditto -	- Aug. "	
	William Henry P. Weston	- ditto -	- Mar. 1858	
	John Fox	Surgeon	- Mar. "	Non-resident.
	William Talbot	Gentleman	- Mar. "	
	William Symonds	- ditto -	- Mar. "	Acting.
	John Taylor	- ditto -	- Mar. "	Non-acting.
	Henry Tizard	Doctor of Medicine	- April 1869	
	Henry Raggett	Gentleman	- April "	Acting.
	Joseph Drew	Doctor of Laws	- April "	
	George Reynolds	Gentleman	- April "	Did not qualify.
	James Lithgow	Surgeon	- April "	
	James Robertson	Draper	- Nov. 1874	Acting.
	James Milledge	Auctioneer	- Nov. "	
	Reginald P. Simpson	Surgeon	- Nov. "	
	Benjamin Hopkins	Gentleman	- Nov. "	
	Thomas Abbott	- ditto -	- Nov. "	
Wigan	James Burrows (Mayor)	Civil Engineer	Nov. 1874.	Non-resident.
	N. Eckersley (Ex-Mayor)	Banker.		
	Samuel McClure	Gentleman	April 1850	
	Jonathan Lamb	- ditto -	April "	Non-resident; has not acted for upwards of one year.
	Thomas Byrom	Merchant	April "	
	Joseph Meek	Draper	April "	
	Joseph Ingram	Agent	April "	Not acted for upwards of one year.
	Richard Taylor	Cotton Spinner	April 1861.	
	Henry Woods	- ditto -	April "	
	John Cross	- ditto -	April "	Not acted for upwards of one year.
	Thomas Marshall	- ditto -	April "	
	Thomas Whaley	Colliery Proprietor	Dec. 1866	
	George Gilroy	Colliery Manager	Dec. "	Resident, and acting.
	William Bryham	- ditto -	Dec. "	
	Richard Burland	Merchant	Dec. "	
	James Fairclough	Builder	Dec. "	Resident, and acting.
	Thomas Wall	Printer	Dec. "	
	William Lea	Colliery Proprietor	Oct. 1869.	
	William Roocroft	Surgeon	Oct. "	Resident, and acting.
	William Melling	Ironfounder	Oct. "	
	Joseph Wilson	Builder	Aug. 1870.	
	James Johnson	Cotton Spinner	Aug. "	Resident, and acting.
	R. A. Harington	Bank Manager	June 1874.	
	Ralph Hilton	Agent	June "	
	William J. Lamb	Colliery Proprietor	June "	Resident, and acting.
	Richard F. Hopwood	Cotton Spinner	June "	
City of Winchester	William Whitear Bulpett	Banker	About 1840	Resident, and acting.
	George William Johnson	Barrister-at-Law	About "	
	Charles Wright	Esquire	- Dec. 1857	
	William Barrow Simonds, M.P.	- ditto -	14 Jan. 1859	Resident, but non-acting.
	William Budden	- ditto -	2 Nov. 1865	
	Thomas Gunner	Barrister-at-Law	- Dec. 1866	
	Samuel John Luke Nicoll	Colonel in the Army	- Dec. "	Resident, and acting.
	Arthur Paul	Esquire	- Dec. "	
	Thomas Hitchcock	Doctor of Medicine	- Dec. "	
	Frederick Morshead	Esquire	26 Dec. 1873	
	Robert Poulsome Forder	- ditto -	26 Dec. "	
	Charles Fielder	- ditto -	26 Dec. "	
Windsor, New	William Brown Holderness	Surgeon	Aug. 1857	Non-resident; has not acted for upwards of a year.
	William Redford Harris	Schoolmaster	Feb. 1866.	
	Edward Pearl	Surgeon	Feb. "	
	Joseph Devereux	Hatter	April 1867.	Non-resident; has not acted for upwards of a year.
	Frederick King Copeland	Butcher	Jan. 1870.	
	George Weller	Chemist	Jan. "	
	George Pooley	Draper	Jan. "	Non-resident; has not acted for upwards of a year.
	Thomas Chamberlain	Coal Merchant	Mar. 1874.	
	Henry Williams Jones	Gentleman	Mar. "	
	John Jones	Coal Merchant	Mar. "	Non-resident; has not acted for upwards of a year.
	William Seaward Cantrell	Baker	Mar. "	

The Mayor for the time being is a Justice of the Peace by commission and statute.

The Ex-Mayor for the time being is a Justice of the Peace for one year after he ceases to be Mayor, by statute.

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
Wisbech	Robert Dawbarn	Draper	14 Feb. 1858	No.
	Frederic Ford	Ironmonger	24 Feb. 1869	
	John Hampson	Corn Merchant	24 Feb. "	
	George Dawbarn	Draper	28 May 1873	
	William Groom	Surgeon	28 May "	
	John Clarkson Maynard	ditto	28 May "	
	Arthur William English	Timber Merchant	28 May "	
	John Minnitt Mason (Mayor)	Bone Setter	9 Nov. 1874	
Wolverhampton	Sir John Morris, Knight	Agricultural Chemist	1867	Non-resident; but having business premises in borough.
	John Moreton	Merchant	1867	
	Samuel Loveridge	Ironfounder	1867	
	Charles Benjamin Mander	Varnish Manufacturer	1863	Resident.
	Henry Walker	Maltster	27 July 1849	
	John Ford	Merchant	1867	Non-resident; but having business premises in borough.
	Frederick Walton	Japanner	1858	
	Moses Irrannayer	Gentleman	1858	Resident.
	George Lees Underhill	Iron Merchant	1858	
	John Hartley	Iron Manufacturer	27 July 1849	Non-resident; but having business premises in borough.
	Benjamin Hicklin	Gentleman	1858	
	Thomas Randle Andrews	ditto	27 July 1849	Non-resident and non-acting for upwards of a year. Traveling on the Continent.
				Non-acting for upwards of a year; but acts on County Bench.
Worcester	Charles Sidebottom (Police Magistrate).	Barrister-at-Law	23 Mar. 1836. 4 Dec. 1837. Under Royal Sign Manual.	Non-acting for upwards of a year; but acts on County Bench.
	Thomas Gale Curtler	Gentleman	28 Dec. 1841	
	Thomas Chalk	ditto	3 Dec. 1849	
	Richard Padmore	ditto	3 Dec. "	
	Edward Webb	ditto	29 April 1856.	
	The Honourable John Slaney Pakington.	ditto	18 Sept. 1858	
	James Coucher	ditto	12 July "	
	Alexander Clunes Sherriff, M. P.	ditto	3 April 1865.	
	Thomas Rowley Hill	ditto	3 April "	
	William Laslett	ditto	23 Jan. 1869.	
	Joseph Wood	ditto	23 Sept. 1871.	
	James Dyson Perrens	Worcestershire Sauce Manufacturer.	23 Sept. "	
	John Longmore	Gentleman	6 Oct. "	
	John Parker	ditto		
	Francis Woodward	ditto	24 Jan. 1873.	
	Richard Evans Barnett	ditto	25 July 1874.	
	Walter Holland	Ironfounder	25 July "	
	Christopher Charles Whitney Griffiths.	Draper	25 July "	
Wrexham	Richard Smith	Nurseryman	25 July "	Has not qualified.
	Thomas Best Burrow	Gentleman	25 July "	
	Henry Willis	Boot and Shoe Manufacturer.	25 July "	
	Robert Lloyd (Mayor)	Draper	9 Nov. 1873.	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, Bart.		9 Nov. 1874.	
			26 Mar. 1858	
	Edward Williams	Doctor of Medicine	26 Mar. "	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	Henry Warter Meredith	Esquire	26 Mar. "	
	Thomas Lloyd Fitzhugh	Esquire	26 Mar. "	
	Simon York	Esquire	26 Mar. "	
	James Hassall Foulkes	Esquire	26 Mar. "	
	Thomas Parry Jones Parry	Esquire	26 Mar. "	
	William Langford Foulkes	Barrister-at-Law	26 Mar. "	Non-acting for upwards of a year, and non-resident.
	Daniel McCoy	Major	26 Mar. "	
	Thomas Taylor Griffith	Surgeon	26 Mar. "	
	Charles Hughes	Stationer	- June 1864.	

NAME OF BOROUGH.	Total Number of Justices of the Peace.		Date of Appointment.	Whether Non-Resident or Non-Acting for upwards of a Year.
	Name.	Profession.		
<i>Trexham—continued</i>	Tubal Cain Jones - - -	Draper - - -	- June 1864.	Non-acting for upwards of a year, and non-resident.
	Edward Fench - - -	Land Agent - - -	- June "	
	Anthony Dillon - - -	Accountant - - -	- June "	
	Thomas Eyton Jones - - -	Surgeon - - -	- Jan. 1867.	Non-acting for a year.
	Thomas Painter - - -	Gentleman - - -	- Jan. "	
	William Low - - -	Colliery Proprietor - - -	- Feb. 1870.	
	William Henry Darby - - -	- ditto - - -	- Feb. "	Non-acting for a year.
	Edward Davies - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	- Feb. "	
	John Pryce Jones - - -	Schoolmaster - - -	- Feb. 1873.	
	Alexander Wilson Edwards - - -	Gentleman - - -	- Feb. "	Non-acting for a year.
	William Overton - - -	- ditto - - -	- Jan. 1875.	
	John Bury - - -	Accountant - - -	- Jan. "	
	Edward Williams - - -	Mine Agent - - -	- Jan. "	
<i>armouth, Great</i>	John Wilton Shelley - - -	Gentleman - - -	1840 - -	Non-resident for a year.
	William Johnson - - -	- ditto - - -	1840 - -	Non-acting for a year.
	John Caporn Smith - - -	Surgeon - - -	1841.	Non-acting for a year.
	William Thurtell - - -	Gentleman - - -	1846 - -	
	Benjamin Jay - - -	- ditto - - -	1846.	
	John Fenn - - -	- ditto - - -	1846.	Non-resident for a year.
	William Hurry Palmer - - -	Merchant - - -	1846 - -	
	James Cherry - - -	Barrister-at-Law - - -	1852 - -	
	Charles Cory Aldred - - -	Surgeon - - -	1852.	Non-acting for a year.
	Philip Pullyn - - -	Gentleman - - -	1858 - -	
	Frederick Palmer - - -	Surgeon - - -	1858.	
	Francis Worship - - -	Gentleman - - -	1859.	Non-acting for a year.
	Edward Pitt Youell - - -	Banker - - -	1859.	
	John Clark - - -	Merchant - - -	1859.	
	Edward Reynolds Aldred - - -	Jeweller - - -	1868 - -	Non-acting for a year.
	Charles Woolverton - - -	Gentleman - - -	1868.	
	Robert David Barber - - -	Actuary - - -	1868.	
	Salmon Palmer - - -	Gentleman - - -	1871.	Non-acting for a year.
	Garson Blake - - -	Ship Owner - - -	1871.	
	John William De Caux - - -	Fish Salesman and Auctioneer.	1871.	
	John Henry Fellows - - -	Shipbuilder - - -	1872.	Non-acting for a year.
	Frederick Dendy - - -	Farmer - - -	1872.	
	Samuel Waters Spelman - - -	Estate Agent and Auctioneer.	1872.	
	Henry Edmund Buxton - - -	Banker - - -	1873.	Non-acting for a year.
	Garwood Burton Palmer - - -	Linen Draper - - -	1873.	
	William Palgrave Brown - - -	Timber Merchant - - -	1873.	
	Allison Davie Stone - - -	Ship Owner - - -	1873.	Non-acting for a year.
	James Henry Orde - - -	Banker - - -	1873.	
	Edmund Henry Harvey Combe - - -	Maltster - - -	1873.	
	Henry Teasdel (Mayor) - - -	Ship Chandler - - -	1873 and 1874.	
<i>cevil</i>	T. Greenham, Esq. - - -	Gentleman - - -	1 Jan. 1855	All resident.
	Thomas Whitby - - -	- ditto - - -	31 Dec. 1870	
	H. B. Phelps - - -	- ditto - - -	31 Dec. "	
	W. F. Tomkyns - - -	Surgeon - - -	31 Dec. "	
<i>ork, City</i>	John Robert Mills - - -	Esquire - - -	21 April 1842	Non-acting for upwards of a year.
	George Wilson - - -	- ditto - - -	10 Aug. 1855.	
	Sir James Meek - - -	Knight - - -	10 Aug. "	
	William Charles Anderson - - -	Surgeon - - -	10 Aug. "	Non-acting for a year.
	William Dalla Husband - - -	- ditto - - -	18 Nov. 1858.	
	Ralph Weatherley - - -	Esquire - - -	- Nov. 1867.	
	Edwin Wade - - -	- ditto - - -	- Nov. "	Non-acting for a year.
	David Hill - - -	- ditto - - -	- Nov. "	
	Joshua Oldfield - - -	- ditto - - -	- Nov. "	
	George Shann - - -	Doctor of Medicine - - -	- Nov. "	Being successive Lord Mayors, and, as such, Justices during their year of office, and one year afterwards.
	Robert Davies - - -	Esquire - - -	10 Aug. 1855.	
	John March - - -	Brewer - - -	9 Nov. 1873	
	Joseph Terry - - -	Confectioner - - -	9 Nov. 1874	Justice during the term of his office.
	Edwin Plumer Price, q.c., Recorder.	Esquire - - -	4 Sept. 1866	

RETURN giving the NAMES and PROFESSIONS of all the JUSTICES OF THE PEACE in the various BOROUGHs and CITIES in *England* and *Wales*, on the 1st day of March 1875, with the Dates of their Appointments; showing where any of them had become Non-Resident, or had ceased from any other cause for a Year or upwards to attend the Bench.

(*Mr. Joseph Cowen.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
4 August 1875.

[*Price 6 d..*]

388.

Under 6 oz.

LICENSING ACT, 1874 (POPULOUS PLACES):

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 6 April 1875;—for,

“RETURN, showing the Number of PLACES with a Population above 1,000 (not being Towns or Urban Sanitary Districts), in respect of which Applications have been made to the Licensing Committees of Counties to declare such Places ‘POPULOUS PLACES,’ under the Licensing Act, 1874, showing the Results of such Applications.”

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared “Populous Places,” under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
ENGLAND:		
BEDFORD - - -	The parish of Ampthill - - - - -	Granted.
	The parish of Biggleswade, exclusive of the hamlets of Stratton and Holm. - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Leighton Buzzard - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Woburn - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Sandy, including the hamlet of Girtford, but excluding all other hamlets in the parish. - - - - -	- ditto.
BUCKINGHAM - - -	Hanslope - - - - -	Refused.
	Princes Risborough - - - - -	- ditto.
	Linslade - - - - -	Granted.
	Amersham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Chesham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Newport Pagnell - - - - -	- ditto.
	Fenny Stratford - - - - -	- ditto.
	Stony Stratford - - - - -	- ditto.
	Great Marlow - - - - -	- ditto.
	Olney - - - - -	- ditto.
CAMBRIDGE - - -	Winslow - - - - -	- ditto.
	Wolverton - - - - -	Refused.
	Parish of Chesterton - - - - -	Granted.
	Parish of Royston, and so much of the parishes of Bassingbourn, Kneesworth, and Melbourn, as lies within one mile of the parish church of Royston. - - - - -	- ditto.
ISLE OF ELY - - -	So much of the parish of Soham as lies within the area contained within a circle, the radius of which is half a mile from the parish church of Soham. - - - - -	- ditto.
	Such part of the parish of Littleport as is comprised within a radius of one mile from the centre of the eastern wall of the chancel of the parish church of Littleport - - - - -	
	Such part of the parish of Chatteris as is comprised within a radius of seven furlongs from the centre of the eastern wall of the chancel of the parish church of Chatteris - - - - -	
	Such part of the parish of Thorney as is comprised within a radius of three quarters of a mile from the centre of the eastern wall of the abbey or parish church of Thorney - - - - -	
	Such portion of the parish of Upwell within the Isle of Ely as lies within the distance of 100 yards from the centre of that part of the highway road from Wisbech which passes through the centre of the village of Upwell, and extends from the boundary between the said parish of Upwell, and the parish of Outwell in this Isle on the north, and Three Holes Bridge on the south - - - - -	Declared “Populous Places” by the County Licensing Committee.

NAME OF COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
CORNWALL	Villages of Pendeen, Trevellard, and Boscaswell.	Refused.
	Lanner Village	- ditto.
	Parishes of Maker and Rame	Granted.
	Millbrook Village	- ditto.
	Town of St. Mawes	- ditto.
	So much of the parish of St. Austell as lies within a radius of half a mile from the east end of Charlestown Church	
	The town and parish of Mevagissey	
	The whole of the parish of St. Blazey	
	So much of the parish of Fowey as lies within a radius of a quarter of a mile from the church-tower	
	So much of the parish of Tywardreath as is comprised within the villages of Tywardreath, Par Station, Par, and Polmear	
	The town of Torpoint, in the parish of Antony, to the extent of its ecclesiastical district.	
	The town and parish of Callington, excluding the district of Newbridge in the said parish.	
	Those parts of the parish of Calstock which are respectively called Calstock Town and Gunnislake	
	So much of the parish of St. Breock as is comprised in the town of Wadebridge and its suburb called Guinea Port, and so much of the parish of Egloshayle as lies within a radius of three quarters of a mile from the eastern end of the bridge called Wadebridge.	
	So much of the parish of Breage as lies within a radius of half a mile from the church tower	
	Also such parts of the parishes of Breage and Sithney as lie within a radius of half a mile from the junction of the quay at Portleven with the mainland	
	So much of the parish of St. Just in Penwith as lies within a radius of half a mile from the church tower	
	The town and parish of Marazion	
	So much of the parish of Paul as is included in a radius of half a mile from the western end of Newlyn Bridge	
	So much of the parish of Budock as lies within the limits of the Parliamentary borough of Penryn and Falmouth.	
	So much of the parish of Falmouth as is not included in the limits of the municipal borough	
	So much of the parish of St. Gluvias as lies within the limits of the Parliamentary borough of Penryn and Falmouth	
	The town of St. Day and village of Vogue in the parish of Gwennap	
	So much of the parish of Mylor as lies within the Parliamentary borough of Penryn and Falmouth	
	So much of the town of St. Agnes, in the parish of St. Agnes, as lies within a radius of half a mile from the tower or steeple of the parish church	
	So much of the village of Chacewater, in the parishes of Kea and Kenwyn, as lies within a radius of 600 yards from the market house in the said village	
	So much of the parish of Illogan as lies within 500 yards on either side of the turnpike road leading from Redruth to Camborne	
		De clared "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee.

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
CUMBERLAND	Wigton	Granted.
	Egremont	- ditto.
	Alston	- ditto.
	Millom	- ditto.
	Harrington	- ditto.
	Stanwix	- ditto.
	Longtown	- ditto.
	Frizington	- ditto.
DERBY	Belper	Granted.
	Codnor and Loscoe	- ditto.
	Long Eaton	- ditto.
	Pleasley	- ditto.
	Stapenhill	- ditto.
	Wivshill	- ditto.
	Ashover	Refused.
	Duffield	- ditto.
	Morton	- ditto.
	Norton	- ditto.
	Pilsley	- ditto.
	Pinxton	- ditto.
	Repton	- ditto.
	Shirland	- ditto.
	South Normanton	- ditto.
	South Wingfield	- ditto.
	Swanwick	- ditto.
	Tibshelf	- ditto.
	Unstone	- ditto.
	Barrow Hill (one quarter of a mile from the Workman's Hall, at Barrow Hill, in the parish of Staveley).	Declared "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee.
	Brimington (one quarter of a mile from the parish church).	
	Clay Cross (half a mile from St. Bartholomew's Church).	
	Riddings (three quarters of a mile from the church).	
	Staveley (one quarter of a mile from the public watering place in the High-street, near the Crown Inn).	
	Bradwell (one quarter of a mile from Town Head).	
	Chapel-en-le-Frith (half a mile from the parish church).	
	Charlesworth (half a mile from the parish church).	
	Compstall (three quarters of a mile from the Compstall toll-bar, on the turnpike-road between Marple and Compstall).	
	Eyam (one mile from the junction of the road in Middleton Dale).	
	Hathersage (half a mile from the Ordnance Arms).	
	Hayfield (three quarters of a mile from the church).	
	Mellor (half a mile from the present post-office).	
	Tideswell (three quarters of a mile from the church).	
	Wirksworth (half a mile from the town hall)	
DEVON	Youlgreave (half a mile from the Market Cross).	Declared "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee.
	Codnor and Loscoe (one mile and a quarter from Cross Hill Church).	
	Long Eaton (half a mile from the parish church)	
	Axminster	
	Berry Pomeroy	
	Bovey Tracey	
	Bradinch	
	Buckfastleigh	
	Budeaux, St.	
	Budleigh, East	
	Chagford	
	Chudleigh	
	Colyton	

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	"Result of such Applications.
DEVON—continued	Combmartin - - - - -	
	Dodbrooke - - - - -	
	Heavitree (the part within Parliamentary Borough of Exeter) - - - - -	
	Highweek - - - - -	
	Kenton - - - - -	
	Kingsbridge - - - - -	
	Littleham and Exmouth - - - - -	
	Moretonhampstead - - - - -	
	Nicholas, St. - - - - -	
	Pilton (the part within Parliamentary Borough of Barnstaple) - - - - -	Declared "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee.
	Plympton St. Mary - - - - -	
	Plympton Maurice - - - - -	
	Plymstock, Seaton, and Beer - - - - -	
	Tavistock - - - - -	
	Withycombe Raleigh - - - - -	
	Bishopstawton (the part within Parliamentary Borough of Barnstaple) - - - - -	
	Brixham (the part called Higher Brixham) - - - - -	
	Topsham (excepting Countess Wear) - - - - -	
	East Stonehouse town (the collection of houses adjacent, called Millbay). - - - - -	Granted.
	Cullompton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Woodbury - - - - -	- ditto.
	Lypstone - - - - -	- ditto.
	North Tawton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Hatherleigh - - - - -	- ditto.
	Ashburton - - - - -	- ditto.
	St. Leonard - - - - -	- ditto.
	Alphington - - - - -	Refused.
	Aylesbeare - - - - -	- ditto.
	Bishopsteignton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Broadclist - - - - -	- ditto.
	Exminster - - - - -	- ditto.
	Countess Wear (in Topsham) - - - - -	- ditto.
	Kenn - - - - -	- ditto.
	Lifton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Thorverton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Stockland - - - - -	- ditto.
	Wirkleigh - - - - -	- ditto.
	Morchard Bishop - - - - -	- ditto.
	Silverton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Kingsteignton (radius of half mile from church tower). - - - - -	Granted.
	Uffculme (radius of half mile from church tower). - - - - -	- ditto.
	Modbury (radius of half mile from White Hart Hotel). - - - - -	- ditto.
	Holsworthy - - - - -	Refused.
	Braunton (radius of half mile from the four cross-ways in centre of the village). - - - - -	Granted.
DORSET	Gillingham - - - - -	Declared "Populous Places."
	Stalbridge - - - - -	
	Bere Regis - - - - -	
ESSEX (Western Division).	The parish of Great Dunmow (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	Granted.
	The parish of Thaxted (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parishes of Chipping Ongar and High Ongar (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parishes of Epping and Thoydon Garnon (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parishes of Ingatestone and Fryerning (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parishes of Stansted Mountfitchet and Birchanger (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Harlow (certain defined parts thereof). - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Great Bardfield - - - - -	Refused.

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
ESSEX (Southern Division).	The parish of Rayleigh - - - - -	Granted.
	The parishes of Rochford and Eastwood (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Grays Thurrock (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Rainham (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Great Burstead (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parishes of South Weald and Shenfield (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Great Wakering - - - - -	Refused.
	The parish of Leigh - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Prittlewell - - - - -	- ditto.
ESSEX (Eastern Division).	The parish of Walton-on-the-Naze - - -	Granted.
	The parish of Kelvedon (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Heybridge (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Burnham (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of East Donyland (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Brightlingsea (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Bocking (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parishes of Elmstead and Wivenhoe (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parishes of Great and Little Coggeshall (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parish of Southminster - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Great Clacton - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Castle Hedingham - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Dedham (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
	The parishes of Earls Colne and White Colne (certain defined parts thereof).	- ditto.
GLOUCESTER	Haverhill Hamlet - - - - -	Refused.
	Almondsbury - - - - -	Refused.
	Avening - - - - -	Refused (except that part of the parish which is situate in Nailsworth).
	Berkeley - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Bitton (part of) - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place according to a plan.
	Bourton-on-the-Water - - - - -	Refused.
	Brierley Hill - - - - -	- ditto.
	Bream - - - - -	- ditto.
	Chipping Campden - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Cinderford, part of East Dean - - - -	- ditto.
	Dymock - - - - -	Refused.
	Dursley - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Drybrook - - - - -	Refused (population too scattered).
	Eastington - - - - -	Refused.
	Fairford - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Flaxley - - - - -	Refused.
	Frampton Cotterell (part of) - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Frenchay and Hambrook - - - - -	- ditto.
	Hanham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Hawkesbury Hamlet and Hillsley Tithing	Refused (population too scattered).

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
GLOUCESTER— <i>cont^d</i>	Iron Acton - - - - -	Refused.
	Kingstanley - - - - -	- ditto.
	Kingswood-in-Bitton - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Lechlade - - - - -	- ditto.
	Lydney - - - - -	- ditto.
	Mangotsfield Downend and Staple Hill - - -	Declared to be a populous place as defined by a plan.
	Mitcheldean - - - - -	Refused.
	Marshfield - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Moreton-in-Marsh - - - - -	- ditto.
	Nailsworth Township - - - - -	- ditto.
	Newent - - - - -	- ditto.
	Northleach, with Eastington - - - - -	- ditto.
	Olveston - - - - -	Refused.
	Painswick - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Pucklechurch - - - - -	Refused.
	Sodbury, Chipping - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Stapleton, with Fishponds - - - - -	- ditto.
	Stonehouse, Lower - - - - -	- ditto.
	Thornbury - - - - -	- ditto.
	Uplands - - - - -	Refused.
	Westbury-on-Trym (part of) - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Wickwar - - - - -	Refused.
	Winchcomb - - - - -	Declared to be a populous place.
	Winterbourne - - - - -	- ditto.
	Wotton-under-Edge - - - - -	- ditto.
	Whitecroft - - - - -	Refused.
	Yate - - - - -	Refused (population too scattered).
HERTFORD (Hertford Division).	Harpenden - - - - -	Granted.
HUNTINGDON	Somersham - - - - -	Refused.
KENT (Eastern Division).	New Romney - - - - -	Granted.
	Lydd - - - - -	- ditto.
	Boughton-under-Blean - - - - -	- ditto.
	Greenstreet - - - - -	Refused.
	Whitstable - - - - -	Granted.
	St. Lawrence - - - - -	- ditto.
	Willesborough - - - - -	Refused.
	Wye - - - - -	Granted.
	Rainham - - - - -	- ditto.
KENT (Western Division).	Eastry - - - - -	- ditto.
	Broadstairs - - - - -	- ditto.
	Edenbridge - - - - -	Refused.
	Sutton Valence - - - - -	- ditto.
	Town Malling - - - - -	Granted.
	Westerham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Yalding - - - - -	Refused.
	Staplehurst - - - - -	- ditto.
	Cranbrook - - - - -	Granted.
LANCASTER	Hawkhurst - - - - -	Refused.
	Goudhurst - - - - -	- ditto.
LANCASTER	Township of Waltone-le-Dale - - - - -	Refused.
	So much of the township of Barrowford Booth as is comprised within the provisions of the Acts relating to the supply of gas and water to the Local Government District of Nelson.	- ditto.

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
LINCOLN (Parts of Holland).	Skirbeck - - - - - Skirbeck Quarter - - - - - Donington - - - - - Gosberton - - - - -	Granted. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto.
LINCOLN (Parts of Kesteven).	No applications have been made to the County Licensing Committee; but after they had, at their first and only meeting after the passing of the Act of 1874, declared four areas only to be Populous Places, there were applications made from Billingborough, Market Deeping, and Deeping St. James, to one of the Petty Sessional Benches, who were unable to make any order.	
LINCOLN (Division of Spilsby, in the parts of Lindsey).	Burgh-le-Marsh - - - - - Spilsby - - - - - Wainfleet, All Saints - - - - -	Granted. - ditto. - ditto.
MONMOUTH (a) - -	New Tredegar - - - - - Abertillery - - - - - Blaina - - - - - Risca - - - - -	Refused. Declared "Populous Places" by the Licensing Committee.
NORFOLK - - -	Ditchingham - - - - -	Refused.
NORTHAMPTON - -	Brackley, St. James, and Brackley, St. Peter (excluding the hamlets of Halse and Brackley Hatch) - - - - - Warkworth (including the hamlet of Grimsbury, but excluding the hamlets of Overthorpe, Huscote, and Nethercote) - - - - - Oundle - - - - - Thrapston - - - - - Weedon Beck, and so much of the parish of Dodford as lies on the eastern side of the London and North Western Railway (b). Flore (b) - - - - - Yardley Hastings (b) - - - - - Kingsthorpe (b) - - - - - Earls Barton (b) - - - - - Hardingstone (b) - - - - - Long Buckby (b) - - - - - Rothwell (b) - - - - - Towcester (b) - - - - -	Declared "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee. Granted. Refused. - ditto. Granted. Refused. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. Granted.
NOTTINGHAM - -	Bingham - - - - - Bulwell - - - - - Calverton - - - - - Carlton - - - - - Eastwood - - - - - Greasley - - - - - Ruddington - - - - - Ratcliffe-on-Trent - - - - - Kirkby-in-Ashfield - - - - - Selstone - - - - - Stapleford - - - - - Standard Hill - - - - - Ordsall, part of - - - - - Clarlborough, part of - - - - -	Granted. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto. - ditto.
SOMERSET - - -	Banwell - - - - - Bishops Lydeard - - - - - Nailsea - - - - - Pill - - - - - Langport - - - - - Martock - - - - - Stoke-sub-Hamden - - - - - East Coker - - - - - West Coker - - - - -	Granted. Refused. - ditto. Granted. Refused. Granted. Refused. - ditto. - ditto.

(a) Several places (other than Towns, &c.) have been declared "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee without any application having been made on behalf of such localities.

(b) The parishes marked thus (b) were the only ones that made application; those not so marked were declared to be "Populous Places" by the County Licensing Committee at a meeting especially convened to consider all cases in which it was incumbent upon them to make orders.

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
SOUTHAMPTON - - -	Stockbridge and Longstock - - - - -	Refused.
	Hartley Wintney - - - - -	- ditto.
	Farnborough - - - - -	- ditto.
	Rowlands Castle - - - - -	- ditto.
	Yarmouth and Norton (Isle of Wight) - - -	- ditto.
	Christchurch, for enlargement of district as previously determined.	Granted.
	Bishops Waltham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Eling - - - - -	Application made too late.
STAFFORD - - -	Cheadle - - - - -	Granted.
	Knutton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Wolstanton - - - - -	- ditto.
	Uttoxeter - - - - -	- ditto.
	Stone - - - - -	- ditto.
	Eccleshall - - - - -	- ditto.
	Brockmoor - - - - -	- ditto.
	Pensnett - - - - -	- ditto.
	Amblecote - - - - -	- ditto.
	Wordsley - - - - -	- ditto.
	Kingswinford - - - - -	- ditto.
	Kinver - - - - -	Refused.
	Fazeley - - - - -	- ditto.
SUFFOLK (Eastern Division).	Melton - - - - -	Granted.
SUFFOLK (Western Division).	Haverhill - - - - -	Granted.
	Brandon - - - - -	- ditto.
	Bures, St. Mary - - - - -	- ditto.
	Glemsford - - - - -	- ditto.
	Ixworth - - - - -	- ditto.
	Lavenham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Melford - - - - -	- ditto.
	Rickingham Inferior - - - - -	- ditto.
	Bildeston - - - - -	Refused.
SURREY - - -	Walton-on-Thames - - - - -	Refused.
	Frimley - - - - -	- ditto.
	Weybridge - - - - -	- ditto.
	Cobham - - - - -	- ditto.
	Esher - - - - -	- ditto.
	Chertsey (excluding Addlestone, Newham, Woodham, Lyne, and Longcross) - - -	These places have been determined to be Populous Places by the County Licensing Committee.
	Egham (portion) - - - - -	
	Leatherhead (within one mile from the parish church of Leatherhead, measured in a straight line) - - - - -	
WARWICK - - -	The parish of Alcester - - - - -	Granted.
	The parish of Aston, near Birmingham - - -	- ditto.
	The township of Atherstone - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Bedworth - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Coleshill - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Foleshill - - - - -	- ditto.
	The township of Henley-in-Arden - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Kenilworth - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Kineton - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Polesworth - - - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Southam - - - - -	- ditto.
YORK (Liberty of Ripon).	The parish of Solihull (part of) - - - - -	- ditto.
	The Ecclesiastical District of Sutton Coldfield - - -	- ditto.
	High and Low Bishopside - - - - -	Refused.*

* At a meeting of the Licensing Committee for the Liberty of Ripon, held on the 28th April 1874, the following resolution was passed:—"The Committee, after having taken into consideration the provisions of the statute 37 & 38 Vict. c. 37, decide, that there is no area within the Liberty of Ripon that comes within the definition of 'a Populous Place' within the meaning of the Act."

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
WARWICK—continued.	The parish of Tamworth (part of) - - -	Granted.
	The parish of Stoke - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Studley - - -	- ditto.
	The hamlet of Hartshill - - -	- ditto.
	The parish of Bidford - - -	- ditto.
	From Publicans in the Parishes of—	
	Exhall - - -	Refused.
	Allesley - - -	- ditto.
	Sowe - - -	- ditto.
	From the Landlords of—	
	The Shepherd and Shepherdess - - -	- ditto.
	The Hare and Hounds Inns in the parish of Keresley. - - -	- ditto.
WILTS - - -	Market Lavington - - -	Refused.
	West Lavington - - -	- ditto.
	Mere - - -	Granted.
	Tisbury - - -	- ditto.
	Corsham - - -	- ditto.
	Holt - - -	Refused.
	Lacock - - -	- ditto.
	Heytesbury - - -	- ditto.
	Fisherton Anger - - -	Granted.
	Burdensball - - -	- ditto.
	Ditchampton - - -	- ditto.
	East Hamham - - -	Refused.
	Milford - - -	- ditto.
	Bemerton - - -	- ditto.
	Amesbury - - -	- ditto.
WORCESTER - - -	Downton - - -	- ditto.
	Longbridge Deverell - - -	- ditto.
	Cradley - - -	Granted.
	Lye - - -	- ditto.
	Wollescote - - -	- ditto.
	Moseley - - -	- ditto.
	Kingsheath - - -	- ditto.
	Selly Oak - - -	- ditto.
	Pershore - - -	- ditto.
	Upton-on-Severn - - -	- ditto.
	Shipston-on-Stour - - -	- ditto.
	Halesowen - - -	- ditto.
	Hasbury - - -	- ditto.
	Upper Swinford - - -	- ditto.
	Acoc's Green - - -	- ditto.
YORK, WEST RIDING	Wollaston - - -	- ditto.
	Astwood Bank - - -	Refused.
	Snaith and Cowick - - -	Granted.
	Aldborough and Boroughbridge - - -	- ditto.
	Barnoldswick - - -	- ditto.
	Goole and Hooke - - -	- ditto.
	Rawdon - - -	- ditto.
	Tadcaster East and Tadcaster West - - -	- ditto.
	Morton, East and West - - -	Deferred for further information.
	Steeton-with-Eastburn - - -	- ditto.
	Brotherton - - -	Refused.
	Swinefleet - - -	- ditto.
	Rawcliffe - - -	- ditto.
	Higher Bentham - - -	- ditto.
	Aberford - - -	- ditto.
	Sherburn - - -	- ditto.
	South Milford - - -	- ditto.
	Ackworth - - -	- ditto.

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
YORK, WEST RIDING— <i>continued.</i>	Bradfield (part of) - - - - - Ecclesfield - - - - - Hoyland Nether - - - - - Swinton - - - - - Thorne - - - - - Alverthorpe-with-Thornes (part of) - - - Cleckheaton (part of) - - - - - Clifford-cum-Boston - - - - - Clifton - - - - - Gildersome - - - - - Gomersal (part of) - - - - - Hipperholme-cum-Brighouse (part of) - - Knottingley - - - - - Liversedge - - - - - Northowram (part of) - - - - - Ovenden (part of) - - - - - Saddleworth (part of) - - - - - Settle - - - - - Skircoat (part of) - - - - - South Crosland - - - - - Southowram (part of) - - - - - Staniland - - - - - Stanley-cum-Wrenthorpe (part of) - - - Tong (part of) - - - - - Wetherly - - - - - Wike - - - - -	The Licensing Committees have declared these townships to be Populous Places without formal application having been made.
WALES:		
ANGLESEY	Amlwch - - - - - Beaumaris - - - - - Holyhead - - - - - Menai Bridge - - - - - Llanerchymedd - - - - -	Granted. ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto.
BRECON	Talgarth - - - - -	Refused.
CARDIGAN	Aberayron - - - - - Adpar - - - - - Tregaron - - - - -	Granted. No application made, but declared not to be "Populous Places" by the Licensing Committee.
CARNARVON	Part of the parish of Llanberis - - - - Parts of the parishes of Bangor and Llanllechid The parish of Llandegai - - - - - The parish of Conway - - - - - The borough of Nevin - - - - -	Ordered by the Licensing Committees.
DENBIGH	Those parts of the parish of Ruabon which are situate to the west of Watts' Dyke. Gwersyllt - - - - - Holt - - - - - Bersham - - - - - Broughton - - - - - Brymbo - - - - - Minera - - - - -	Declared as a Populous Place. Declared not to be a "Populous Place." ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto.
FLINT	St. Asaph - - - - -	Refused.
GLAMORGAN	Penarth District to include so much of the parishes of Penarth and Cogan as are bounded by the sea on the east and north sides, and on all other parts by a circle having a radius of three quarters of a mile, of which Penarth church is the centre. A district called Rhondda District, and including all such parts of the parishes of Ystrad-y-fodwg, Llantrissant, and Llanwonno as are comprised in an area extending in length along the course of the Great Rhondda River, from and including Blaen Rhondda, on the north-west, to the point where the said river enters the district of the Local Board of Pontypridd, on the south-east, and in breadth half a mile on each side of the said river.	Granted. ditto.

NAME of COUNTY.	Number of Places which have made Applications to be declared "Populous Places," under Licensing Act, 1874.	Result of such Applications.
GLAMORGAN—cont ^d . -	<p>A district called Taibach, comprising all that part of the parish of Margam which is bounded on the west by the Avon River, on the south by the sea, and on the east and north by two lines, one extending from the sea, south to north, at the distance of a mile to the east of Aberavon Bridge, to meet another line drawn from west to east, at a distance of a quarter of a mile to the north of and parallel to the turnpike-road from Pyle to Aberavon.</p> <p>All that part of the hamlet of Clase Lower which is bounded on the east by the River Tawe, on the south by the borough of Swansea, and on the north and west by two lines, one drawn from a point of the said River Tawe, half a mile north of the Wych Tree Bridge, and extending from east to west till it meets a line drawn from the boundary of the borough of Swansea, parallel to and half a mile west of the said River Tawe.</p> <p>The Ferndale District, comprising all places within a radius of half a mile from Commercial Hotel, Ferndale.</p> <p>All that part of the hamlet of Llangonoyd Higher that lies within a radius of two miles from the Maesteg Police Station.</p> <p>The whole of the hamlet of Michaelstone Lower.</p> <p>All that part of the hamlet of Coedfrank known as Neath Abbey and Skewen, bounded on the east by the borough of Neath, on the north by the Great Western Railway, from the boundary of the borough of Neath to a place called Cwmdy, on the west from Cwmdy, in a straight line to the Vale of Neath Railway at Wain Andrew, and thence on the south along the Vale of Neath Railway from Wain Andrew to the point where the said railway enters the borough of Neath.</p> <p>All that part of the Hamlet of Rhigos bounded on one side by the parish of Aberdare, on two other sides by the boundaries of the same hamlet, and on the remaining side by a line drawn across the hamlet parallel to and at a distance of half a mile from the boundary of the said parish of Aberdare.</p> <p>The following Towns not having sufficient Number of Justices in their Commissions were also declared "Populous Places":</p> <p>The town of Caerphilly. The limits of the said town to be defined by a circle with a radius of half a mile, of which the Boar's Head Inn, in the said town, is the centre.</p> <p>The town and borough of Cowbridge - - -</p> <p>The borough of Llantrisant - - -</p> <p>District of Gwaelodygarth, Tongwynlais, Taff's Well, and Nantgarw.</p> <p>District of Nelson Village, Church Shed, Tairheve Navigation, Craigberthlwyd, Quaker's Yard, Tyn Berthlwyd.</p> <p>Hamlet of Pencoed, Coychurch - - -</p>	<p>Granted.</p> <p>.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>Granted.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>Refused.</p> <p>- ditto.</p> <p>- ditto.</p>
MONTGOMERY - -	<p>Montgomery - - - - -</p> <p>Llanfyllin - - - - -</p>	<p>Refused.</p> <p>- ditto.</p>

LICENSING ACT, 1874 (POPULOUS PLACES).

RETURN showing the Number of Places with a Population above 1,000 (not being Towns or Urban Sanitary Districts), in respect of which Applications have been made to the Licensing Committees of Counties to declare such Places "Populous Places," under the Licensing Act, 1874, showing the Results of such Applications.

(*Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
by June 1875.*

450

SIR CHARLES LYELL.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 6 April 1875 ;—for,

“ COPY of CORRESPONDENCE which has passed between the Lord Chancellor
and the Coroner relative to the INQUEST held upon the Body of the late
Sir Charles Lyell.

— No. 1. —

The Lord Chancellor to the Coroner for Middlesex.

5, Cromwell Houses, South Kensington,
4 March 1875.

Sir

THE attention of the Lord Chancellor has been called to an inquest held by you, as Coroner for Middlesex, on the body of the late Sir Charles Lyell, on the 26th of February last.

From the facts that have been represented to the Lord Chancellor, it would appear that Sir Charles Lyell died on the 22nd February, at the age of 77 ; that he had been suffering from severe illness before and up to the 9th of December, and was attended by Dr. Andrew Clarke, F.R.C.S. ; that on the 9th December he slipped and fell in coming down stairs, and his illness may have been increased by this accident ; that Dr. Andrew Clarke continued his attendance, and that Sir James Paget and Dr. Cassidy also attended professionally. It is further stated that no application was made to you to hold an inquest, nor was any circumstance suggested making it desirable that an inquest should take place. And it is alleged that you insisted on holding the inquest in opposition to the wishes of Sir Charles Lyell's family, and to the expostulations of Dr. Clarke, who furnished you with a certificate of the cause of death. It is further represented that the inquest was held when the body was about to be interred in a public manner, in Westminster Abbey, and after the leaden coffin inclosing the body had been fastened down, and that this coffin had to be opened, and the body partially exposed in order to satisfy the technical rule that the body must be seen by the jury.

The Lord Chancellor is well aware that a coroner has a difficult duty to perform in determining in what cases he ought, and in what cases he ought not to hold an inquest, and that, if he is exposed to criticism or censure on the score of excess of zeal, so also he is liable to penalties if he fail to bring his office and authority to bear upon cases demanding inquiry. A system, however, of holding inquests without any adequate ground or cause, and in wanton disregard of what is due to private and public feeling may amount to that species of misbehaviour for which a coroner may be called upon to answer.

The Lord Chancellor hopes that he may receive from you some explanation of the facts which have been reported to him, or an assurance that greater discretion and discrimination will in future be exercised as to cases in which inquests should be held.

I am, &c.

(signed) *Henry J. L. Graham,*

Wm. Hardwicke, Esq., M.D.,

Coroner for Middlesex.

Principal Secretary.

— No. 2. —

The Coroner for Middlesex to the Lord Chancellor.

Coroner's Office, Richmond Villa, Park-place,
Paddington, W.

My Lord,

IN acknowledging your Lordship's communication I cannot withhold my thanks for the opportunity afforded me of stating fully the facts and circumstances relating to the inquest held on the body of the late Sir Charles Lyell, Bart.

On the 25th February, I received information that Sir Charles' death had been hastened or caused by a fall. As in duty bound I instructed my summoning officer in the customary way to make the usual inquiries at the residence of the deceased. The summoning officer went as directed, but the relatives of the deceased declined to give him any details connected with the death. He was referred to Dr. Andrew Clarke, who had been the medical attendant of the deceased.

On applying to Dr. Clarke, the officer received a memorandum, of which the following is a copy:—

“Death of Sir Charles Lyell.—Meningitis, ten weeks ; Effusion, six days.”

This document taken by itself, and in the absence of any explanation to me from Dr. Clarke, rather confirmed than corrected the information that death had followed from an accident or injury ; meningitis, with subsequent effusion, being, as the experience gained by my office teaches, common consequences of accident. This view was further confirmed by the information supplied to me by the constable, and which showed that the date of the assumed accident corresponded with the date of the commencement of the meningitis. A copy of the information paper, marked No. 1, is herewith appended for your Lordship's consideration ; you will see by that document that the character of the accident was very clearly defined ; that the deceased was stated to have been “found helpless ;” that he had sustained “a fall downstairs ;” had been “under treatment ever since the accident,” and that his death was attributed to “supposed injuries.”

It appeared subsequently that Dr. Clarke had given a medical certificate of death to the registrar of the district ; a copy of which extracted from the registrar's book, and marked No. 2, is enclosed. Of this I had no information at the time my warrant was issued.

These were the facts brought to my knowledge. They left me, as I felt, no alternative but to summon an inquest and I arranged it for the evening of the 26th ultimo, because the funeral had been fixed for the following day.

Your Lordship will, I am sure, understand that for me to have made any further inquiries of a private nature would have been inconsistent with the duties of my office ; and as no explanation was tendered to me disposing of the information on which the warrant was demanded, I issued the warrant, not without the extremest reluctance, under the solemn conviction that, in so doing, I was but carrying out the proper duties of my office.

By strict rule, and by every precedent with which I am acquainted, I was bound to hold the inquiry under these circumstances. If any one of the medical attendants upon Sir Charles had communicated to me, personally, or by letter, the details of the accident, and of its effect on the course of the illness, I might possibly have seen it unnecessary to hold the inquiry. As a matter of fact, the opportunity for such consideration was never afforded me, so that had I on my own instance withheld the warrant, I must have ignored altogether the information I had received, and have accepted the responsibility to which, as your Lordship says, “the coroner is liable if he fail to bring his office and authority to bear upon cases demanding an inquiry.”

I had no reason to doubt that the information submitted to me by the constable respecting the accident might be true, and at the inquest it turned out to be true, for Dr. Clarke admitted, on oath, that it, the accident, had accelerated the death. Copies of the depositions (marked No. 3) taken at the inquest, and supplying this evidence, are appended for your Lordship's reference.

On

On the question of the medical certificate to which your Lordship has referred, I may perhaps be allowed to state what are the rules and precedents held in respect to such certificates in their bearing on the coroner's inquisition. In the medical profession it is held as a rule that if the death of a person be caused by, be accelerated by, or be in any way complicated by, an accident or other physical injury, the medical man in attendance either refuses to give a certificate of a natural cause of death, or communicates to the coroner the precise circumstances under which he thinks such a certificate allowable, leaving it to the coroner to use his own discretion as to the necessity of the inquiry. Such communications have been made to me by the most distinguished practitioners of medicine and surgery, and have always received from me a courteous consideration. But when an exception, as the present, occurs, when a medical certificate conveying the impression of a death from causes purely natural is checked by information that certain causes which are not natural are also connected with the death, and when no explanatory details are vouchsafed to the coroner for his guidance, then the rule is to hold the inquiry. The very discrepancy of evidence enforces the duty, and with all respect to the profession to which I belong, I dare not set the example of allowing the certificate of even the most eminent member of it, to stand as the authoritative record of death when other information is before me on which an official inquiry should be based.

I assure your Lordship that one failure of the authority of the coroner in this direction would be likely to imperil his authority in all his future career, and would be pregnant of danger to the community.

Your Lordship touches on the opposition made by the friends of the deceased baronet to the holding of the inquest. The public can scarcely understand the daily difficulties that lie in the way of the coroner in conducting his inquiry from this same circumstance. There is not a household in which some objections are not raised to the holding of an inquest, which objections are specially maintained and intensified by any suspicion that what may be and is done amongst one class of the community, may be evaded by another. I therefore feel it in the discharge of my duty of supreme moment to act with the most perfect justice to all classes, and in the present case, I simply acted on this principle.

The remaining point in your Lordship's letter relates to the mode of carrying out the inquest.

If the inquest were correct, the necessity of viewing the body was a part of it I had no power to control, for the law is definite upon the point. The same difficulty has been previously presented to other coroners, as well as to myself, in cases where friends, pending the inquest, have taken upon themselves the responsibility of closing the coffin, and without an exception, it has been met by the course I pursued by ordering the coffin to be opened.

These, my Lord, are the facts submitted with all candour for your consideration. That the expression of your opinion that I did but honestly do my duty, in this instance, would relieve me of intense anxiety may well be supposed; but even this is secondary to the desire that I may do it always. If therefore your Lordship in reviewing this case with an impartiality, I can hardly be expected to exercise in a matter so purely personal, should consider that I have in any way exceeded my authority, I shall only be too happy to be guided by your judgment.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Wm. Hardwicke, M.D.*,
Coroner for Central Middlesex.

The Right Honourable Lord Cairns,
Lord High Chancellor.

Enclosures in No 2.

(No. 1.)

(Postage to be paid by the Constable.)

A warrant is requested for an inquest on the body of Sir Charles Lyell, Bart., now lying dead at No. 73, Harley-street, in the parish of St. Marylebone. The inquest to be held at house, No.

The Constable, in all cases, must fill up, and *without delay* forward the following form, and should *attend at the office* of the Coroner in all *doubtful and peculiar* cases.

State age and trade, or other particulars.

Age 77. A gentleman.

State *day* and *hour* of death.

Last Friday, 19th February 1875.

Was the person found helpless, insensible, or dead, and if so, *where*?

Found helpless.

Is the cause known? Is it by injuries?

Supposed injuries.

Is it suspected that poison was taken?

No.

Did any dangerous *illness* exist before the death, and *for how long*?

For about two months.

Is it said *blame* is attached to any party.

Not known.

Did any legally qualified medical man attend *before* death; and *how long* a *time*? If so state his *name* and *residence*.

Yes. Dr. A. Clarke, 16, Cavendish-square.

If not, was one called in *afterwards*? State his *name* and *residence*.

Same.

On what particular ground is a warrant applied for in this case? (*In answer to this question, the constable should state whether it was a sudden death, or whether it was a violent death, as by poisoning, wounds, burns, or scalds, accident, suicide, neglect, ill-usage, &c., or whether the person was found dead, or whether the cause of death is involved in mystery, &c.; if a child, whether at nurse, and if illegitimate.*)

Sir Charles Lyell, Bart., had a fall down stairs about two months ago; has been under treatment by Dr. Clarke ever since the accident.

Constable here to write *his name* and *address*.

Ephraim Stevenson, 14, Clipstone-street, Portland-place.

* * * When anything poisonous is known, or is suspected to have caused the death, the remaining portion should be put under seal, and forthwith delivered to the constable, who is to dispose of it as the Coroner shall direct.

(Indorsement.)

Registrar's District:—All Souls.

Mr. Claxton,
30, Newman-street.

(No. 2.)

1875. DEATHS in the District of Cavendish-square, in the County of Middlesex. Page 44.

No.	When and where died.	Name and Surname.	Sex.	Age.	Rank or Profession.	Cause of Death.	Signature, Description, and Residence of Informant.	When Registered.	Signature of Registrar.
218	22 Feb. 1875 73, Harley-street.	Charles Lyell	Male	77 years.	Baronet	Cerebral meningitis, 10 weeks; effusion, 6 days. Certified by Andrew Clarke, M.D., F.R.C.P.	Marianne Lyell; sister; present at the death. 73, Harley-street, Marylebone.	26 Feb. 1875	Wm. Tookey, Registrar.

I certify that the above-written is a true copy of an entry in the Register Book of Deaths in the district of Cavendish square.
Book No. 17.—Extracted this 5th day of March 1875.

Wm. Tookey, Registrar,
48, High-street, St. Marylebone.

(No. 3.)

MIDDLESEX TO WIT.

DEPOSITIONS of Witnesses taken and acknowledged on behalf our Sovereign Lady the Queen, touching the death of Charles Lyell, at the house known as No. 73, Harley-street, in the parish of St. Marylebone, county of Middlesex aforesaid, on Friday, the 26th day of February 1875, before William Hardwicke, Esq., one of Her Majesty's Coroners for the said county, on view of the body of the said person then and there lying dead.

ANDREW CLARKE having been sworn upon the day and year, and at the place above-mentioned, deposed as follows :—

I reside at 16, Cavendish-square. I am a F.R.C.S., Physician to London Hospital. I have been called in consultation some time ago, and during the autumn months, suffering from vertigo and cerebral disturbance. On the 9th of December I was told that Sir Charles had slipped down stairs, and I saw him soon afterwards. There was a severe contusion over right eye, and Sir James Paget and Mr. Cassidy had charge of the case. I saw him from time to time, with Sir James Paget, and he suffered from the bruise and swelling, and a partial dislocation of the thumb.

The vertigo was increased; he was perfectly sensible, and appeared to be making a complete recovery. An epileptic seizure came on three weeks before death; and from that time symptoms increased in severity, and a few days before death much aggravated, finally comatose, and died.

Cause of Death.—Meningitis, and effusion of serum on brain; these symptoms were accelerated by the fall.

JAMES MOSS, 73, Harley-street, Butler to Sir Charles Lyell.

On the 9th of December last I was out in the morning, and a few minutes on my return I was told that Sir Charles had fallen down stairs. I went to the drawing-room floor and found him sitting on a chair. He had a bruise on the forehead. I assisted him to his room; his left hand was also hurt; his death took place on the 22nd. His eye-sight was bad; nearly blind.

MARY ANN LYELL, Sister of Deceased.

My brother was 77 years old. Lately he was fairly in health and eye-sight. He had medical advice from Dr. Clarke for influenza. December 9th; he met with a fall. I had just left him; he was coming down from his bedroom to the drawing-room; I heard him

him call; he had slipped down 10 steps. The left thumb was hurt, and was bruised on the forehead, and was attended by Sir J. Paget and Dr. Clarke. The head symptoms had subsided at Christmas; but some symptoms. He died on 22nd of this month. He was in no way neglected.

VERDICT:

Meningitis, with effusion of serum on the brain, accelerated by a fall down stairs.

— No. 3. —

The Lord Chancellor to the Coroner for Middlesex.

5, Cromwell Houses, South Kensington,

Sir,

9 March 1875.

I AM directed by the Lord Chancellor to acknowledge your letter, without date, received to day.

The Lord Chancellor desires me in the first place to make some observations on your statement of the circumstances which led you to hold an inquest on the body of Sir Charles Lyell.

The Lord Chancellor assumes that the information which you state you received on the 25th of February, that Sir Charles' death had been hastened or caused by a fall, was the information contained in form filled up by the constable, marked No. 1.

This information was obviously of a character which required explanation and further inquiry. It stated that the deceased had been "found helpless," without saying, as the informant was required to say, "where"; and it rather suggested that he had been "found helpless," at the time of his death. But as to the ground on which a warrant was applied for, it stated, "that Sir Charles Lyell had a fall down stairs about two months before, and been under treatment by Dr. Clarke ever since the accident."

The latter statement would not, without more, have formed an adequate ground for an inquest. And accordingly you appear to have sent your summoning officer to make inquiries at the residence of the deceased.

He was there referred, as was not unusual or inconvenient, to the medical attendant, Dr. Andrew Clarke.

You do not state in what way application was made by your officer to Dr. Andrew Clarke.

It can hardly have been a personal application, or he would not have received the memorandum you set out without some verbal explanation; and it can scarcely have been sent in the form in which you set it out, in answer to an application in writing.

The Lord Chancellor cannot think that if a written application had been made to Dr. Andrew Clarke in your name as coroner, and had been stated to be an application with a view to determine by the answer whether an inquest was or was not necessary, Dr. Andrew Clarke would have failed to give such an explanation of all the facts as, when given before the jury, was at once held to be altogether satisfactory.

The very brief memorandum appears, however, to have been taken without any explanation having been asked for; and the consequence has been an inquest the holding of which has caused much pain and uneasy feeling in the public mind.

You say, "if any of the medical attendants upon Sir Charles had communicated to me personally or by letter the details of the accident, and of its effect on the course of the illness, I might possibly have seen it unnecessary to hold the inquiry." But it appears to the Lord Chancellor that under the circumstances he has pointed out it was incumbent on you, if you desired further information, to have given to the medical attendants, or some or one of them, the opportunity of supplying this information.

The Lord Chancellor is ready to believe that you have acted in this matter under a scrupulous sense of what you considered to be your duty, but he feels obliged to point out to you, as he has done, the considerations which lead him to

to the conclusion that in a more sound and careful exercise of your discretion you would have adopted a different course, and to express a hope that in future more accurate and reliable information will be obtained before proceeding to public investigations of death, which must be so harrowing to the feelings of relatives and households.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Henry J. L. Graham,*
Principal Secretary.

Wm. Hardwicke, Esq., M.D.,
Coroner for Middlesex.

— No. 4. —

The Coroner for Middlesex to the Lord Chancellor.

Richmond Villa, Park-place, Paddington, W.,
16 March 1875.

My Lord,

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's letter, received on Saturday, the 13 instant. I much regret the omission of date to my previous communication. It should have been dated Monday, March 8th, 1875. The omission arose, I doubt not, from the painful circumstance that at the moment of completing the letter, the intelligence reached me of the unexpected death of my brother, Mr. Robert Hardwicke. I trust your Lordship will on these grounds excuse this accidental omission.

From your Lordship's present letter, I understand clearly that the want of discretion imputed to me is included in the circumstance, that the preliminary investigations to the inquest on the body of the late Sir Charles Lyell seem insufficient, in your Lordships' opinion, and that I did not give the medical attendants or some one of them the opportunity of supplying further information than was obtained by seeking it in the usual way, namely, by the personal application of the summoning officer, firstly to the relatives of the deceased, and afterwards, by their direction, to Dr. Andrew Clarke.

That the necessity for a further preliminary enquiry, and for any written application to Dr. Clarke, "in my name as coroner," as your Lordship suggests, did not occur to me, I confess with all candour; but in omitting it, the supposition of inflicting a slight, or avoiding a duty, never entered my mind. I was guided purely by the rule of the coroner's court, which is as far as I know universally followed, that the coroner should himself personally institute no enquiry whatever of those who may afterwards have to appear as witnesses before him in his judicial capacity.

From the force of the usage and tradition of my office, I followed this rule in the case now under consideration, as my predecessors did, and as I myself have invariably done, without assuming any discretionary power of departing from it. Your Lordship's view that the rule may be exceptionally modified, comes, therefore, upon me as a change of preliminary procedure, which I should not on my own instance have ventured to introduce, but which I shall in the future, acting upon your Lordship's suggestion, most carefully consider in all such cases as that which has raised this unfortunate misunderstanding.

I gratefully acknowledge your Lordship's expression of belief that in this matter I have acted under a scrupulous sense of what I considered to be my duty.

I remain, &c.
(signed) *William Hardwicke,*
Coroner for Central Middlesex.

The Right Hon. Lord Cairns,
Lord High Chancellor.

SIR CHARLES LYELL

COPY of CORRESPONDENCE which has passed
between the Lord Chancellor and the Coroner
relative to the Inquest held upon the Body of
the late Sir Charles Lyell.

(Colonel North.)

Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be Printed,
1 July 1875.

NATURALISATION CERTIFICATES.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 2 August 1875 :—for,

“RETURNS, alphabetically arranged, of CERTIFICATES of NATURALISATION issued to ALIENS by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, under the Provisions of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 66, and of the Act 33 Vict. c. 14, stating the COUNTRIES to which such Aliens belonged :

“And, of the Names and Descriptions of all ALIENS who, in each Year since 1871, have obtained from the Legislature Acts of Naturalisation, including the right of Sitting in Parliament and being of Her Majesty's Privy Council (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 142, of Session 1872).”

RETURN, alphabetically arranged, of CERTIFICATES of NATURALISATION issued to ALIENS by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, under the Provisions of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 66, and of the 33 Vict. c. 14, stating the COUNTRIES to which such Aliens belonged.

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
A.			Belisha, Isaac - - - -	Morocco - - - -	21 Oct. 1872
Andreozzi, Hercules - - -	Italy - - - -	19 April 1872	Baumann, Hermann Gustav Wilhelm.	Prussia - - - -	26 " "
Autonozzi, Luigi - - -	- ditto - - - -	30 " "	*Bianco, Moses - - - -	Turkey - - - -	20 Nov. "
*Albrecht, Adolph - - -	Hamburg - - - -	28 May "	†Busch, Joseph Loudon - - -	Russia - - - -	27 " "
Attal, Salom - - - -	Morocco - - - -	2 July "	Baumann, Edward - - -	Germany - - - -	4 Dec. "
Ahlborn, August Freidrich Adolph	Prussia - - - -	22 Aug. "	Brüggmann, James William	Prussia - - - -	6 " "
Andrea, John George Otto - -	Germany - - - -	23 " "	Gustav.		
Aguilar, Juan Vicente - -	Republic of Costa Rica	10 Oct. "	Bing, Louis - - - -	Hungary - - - -	14 " "
Arbib, Eugenio - - - -	France - - - -	15 " "	Berner, Ernest - - - -	Germany - - - -	28 " "
Adamson, Adam - - - -	Russia - - - -	20 " "	Baillin, Frederick - - -	Italy - - - -	17 Jan. 1873
Andreal, John Charles - - -	Germany - - - -	30 Nov. "	Baum, Gottfried - - -	Hamburg - - - -	10 Feb. "
Aufrecht (or Upright), Paul	- ditto - - - -	23 Dec. "	Brasch, Abraham - - -	Prussia - - - -	26 " "
Maurice.			Bach, Guido Richard - - -	Germany - - - -	5 Mar. "
Auerbach, Emil - - - -	- ditto - - - -	9 April 1873	Bursio, Louis Jean Baptiste	Italy - - - -	12 " "
Amoroso, Michele - - - -	Palermo, Sicily - - -	16 June "	Guillaume Ferdinand.		
Aron, Ludwig - - - -	Germany - - - -	14 July "	Bitter, Carl Gustav Adolph -	Germany - - - -	12 " "
Altman, Harris - - - -	Prussia - - - -	24 Oct. "	Braune, Christian Frederick	- ditto - - - -	14 " "
*Adamidi, Nicholas - - -	Greece - - - -	25 Nov. "	Mathas.		
Akesteridi, Peter - - - -	Turkey - - - -	8 Dec. "	Bennett, William - - - -	- ditto - - - -	17 " "
Afriat, Aaron - - - -	Morocco - - - -	6 Feb. 1874	Beck, Carl - - - -	Austria - - - -	27 " "
Arabian, Mardiros - - - -	Turkey - - - -	1 May "	Bass, Albert - - - -	Germany - - - -	7 May "
Auer, August - - - -	Germany - - - -	11 June "	*Bernhardt, George Henry Charles	- ditto - - - -	31 " "
Agolopulo, George A. - - -	Greece - - - -	17 July "	William.		
Achard, Louis Adolphe - - -	Prussia - - - -	30 " "	Bussei, Vincenzo Virginio - -	Italy - - - -	21 June "
Abrahamson, Lion Abraham -	Holland - - - -	29 Aug. "	*Bronner, Edward - - - -	Baden - - - -	8 July "
Alisch, Alexander - - - -	Germany - - - -	22 Jan. 1875	Barany, Nicholas - - - -	Hungary - - - -	8 " "
Abdelmalek, Abdelgani Hyder -	Turkey - - - -	26 Feb. "	Blum, Trydar - - - -	Russia - - - -	16 " "
Aenstoots, Anton - - - -	Germany - - - -	17 April "	Berner, Robert - - - -	Prussia - - - -	19 " "
Achten, Julius Anton - - -	- ditto - - - -	19 " "	Beaupin, Frederick Louis - -	France - - - -	22 " "
Alten, Diedrich Hermann - -	Bremen - - - -	4 May "	Breffé de, Joseph - - - -	Belgium - - - -	31 " "
Arbib, Salvatore - - - -	Turkey - - - -	4 " "	Ben-Zion, Benedix - - - -	Russia - - - -	15 Aug. "
Arnel, Louis Clement - - -	France - - - -	24 " "	Boas, Moritz - - - -	Germany - - - -	15 " "
Artom, Benjamin - - - -	Italy - - - -	28 " "	Behrens, Heinrich - - - -	- ditto - - - -	29 " "
B.			Bergmann, Christian - - - -	- ditto - - - -	5 Sept. "
Balthasar, Otto - - - -	Prussia - - - -	25 Mar. 1872	Birkley, John Baptist - - -	Baden - - - -	29 " "
Brust, John Martin - - - -	Baden - - - -	27 " "	Belhomme, François Cyrille -	France - - - -	6 Oct. "
Bunkmann, Henry - - - -	Prussia - - - -	6 April "	Bernstein, Bernard - - - -	Russia - - - -	17 " "
Bouvier, Gustave Arthur - -	France - - - -	12 " "	Berkwitz, Isaac - - - -	- ditto - - - -	31 " "
Brodmeier, Hermann - - - -	Germany - - - -	16 " "	Berry, True Joseph - - - -	United States of America.	16 Dec. "
Behuke, August Emil - - - -	Prussia - - - -	8 May "	Bernard, André - - - -	France - - - -	23 " "
Braggiotti, John - - - -	Italy - - - -	10 " "	Bartlett, Ellis Ashmead - -	United States of America.	27 Jan. 1874
Bruntsch, Ernest - - - -	Prussia - - - -	16 " "	Baum, Noé Meyer - - - -	Germany - - - -	29 " "
Brash, Isaac - - - -	- ditto - - - -	28 " "	Black, Louis John - - - -	Russian Poland - -	10 Feb. "
Beleher, Isaac - - - -	Russian Poland - - -	31 " "	Bost, Timothy - - - -	Switzerland - - -	13 " "
Budenberg, Arnold Frederick	Germany - - - -	15 June "	Berg, Emil Peter - - - -	Denmark - - - -	31 Mar. "
Ottomar.			Benitz, Andrew - - - -	Germany - - - -	11 April "
Born, Joseph - - - -	Switzerland - - - -	26 " "	Beisiegel, Georg Heinrich Carl	- ditto - - - -	14 May "
†Bizzo, John - - - -	Turkey - - - -	26 " "	Berg, Endré Sivertsen - - -	Norway - - - -	3 June "
Besso, Joseph Mordochéo - -	Greece - - - -	2 July "	Bodmer, John James - - -	Switzerland - - -	5 Aug. "
Besso, Mordochéo Di David -	Turkey - - - -	2 " "	Bessone, John Maria - - -	Portugal - - - -	6 " "
Born, Gustavus Edwin - - -	Prussia - - - -	8 " "	Bockelmann, Johann Hinrich -	Hanover - - - -	24 " "
Berger, Louis - - - -	France - - - -	24 " "	Bockelmann, Johann Peter -	- ditto - - - -	24 " "
Berger, François Charles - -	- ditto - - - -	24 " "	Bonta, Paul - - - -	Italy - - - -	25 " "
Baugert, William Theodore -	Germany - - - -	27 " "	Badian, Marcus - - - -	Austria - - - -	25 " "
*Besso, Sabbato Guiseppe - -	Turkey - - - -	31 " "	Brinkmann, Friedrich - - -	Germany - - - -	11 Sept. "
Bertin, George - - - -	France - - - -	6 Aug. "	Buchele, Johannes - - - -	- ditto - - - -	13 Oct. "
Boon, Pieter - - - -	Netherlands - - -	18 Sept. "	§Biermann, Adolph David Gottlieb	- ditto - - - -	14 " "
Baum, Johann Friedrich - -	Hamburg - - - -	1 Oct. "	Borchardt, Christian Gustav -	- ditto - - - -	20 " "
Blank, Emanuel - - - -	Russia - - - -	7 " "	Braun, Charles - - - -	- ditto - - - -	3 Nov. "
Benani, Mohamed - - - -	Morocco - - - -	21 " "			

* These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

† This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in a foreign country (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

‡ This is a special certificate to a person with respect to whose nationality a doubt exists (under the Act of 1870).

§ This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in Her Majesty's Dominions abroad (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

RETURN OF CERTIFICATES OF NATURALISATION

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
Blum, Johannes	Germany	9 Nov. 1874	*Dettelbach, Charles	Germany	11 June 1872
Bensberg, Caspar Henry	- ditto -	24 Dec. "	Dresel, Adolph Frederick Heinrich Franz Ferdinand.	- ditto -	17 " "
Bose, Henry John William	- ditto -	31 " "	Davis, Wolf	Russia	19 " "
Baumgarten, Carl Heinrich Frederick Emil.	Denmark	9 Jan. 1875	*De Rothschild, Ferdinand James Anselm.	Germany	8 July "
Bender, Heinrich Carl	Germany	13 " "	Dalkeoff, Benjamin	- ditto -	31 Aug. "
Berger, Frederick William Richard.	- ditto -	10 Feb. "	De Landfort, Léon Cerani	France	23 Sept. "
Bergins, Walter Carl	- ditto -	15 " "	Dufer, Augustin	Belgium	28 Oct. "
Bullwinkle, Henrich	- ditto -	16 " "	Danmer, Friedrich Nicolaus	Germany	8 Nov. "
Breant, Eugene Ernest	France	5 Mar. "	Delbarre, Antoine	France	23 " "
Blumenthal, Julius	Germany	31 " "	Delpech, George Marius	- ditto -	14 Jan. 1873
Beach, Albert	Austria	9 April "	De Kuyper, Eugène Adrian Jacques Joseph.	Netherlands	12 Feb. "
Bergl, Moritz	Hungary	10 May "	Drery, Oscar	Germany	7 May "
Binneballe, Carl Iser August	Norway	11 " "	Dalan, Fortunato	Austria	29 " "
Bertin, Pierre Philippe	France	18 " "	Dieck, Heinrich	Germany	30 " "
*Blumfeld, Louis	Germany	18 " "	Dalmbert, Alphonse de Moissac Mayer.	France	30 Aug. "
Booth, Oscar	- ditto -	6 July "	Davis, Rubin	Russian Poland	30 Sept. "
Baerlein, Max	Bavaria	8 " "	De Vries, Frits Klazes	Holland	3 Oct. "
Brennayer, Hermann	Germany	2 Aug. "	Duski, Bolelaw	Russia	6 " "
C.			Dunipe, José	Spain	11 " "
*Clason, Cleon	Germany	30 Mar. 1872	Despotoff, George Anastasius	Russia	27 " "
Courti, Paul	Italy	23 May "	Dilger, Martin	Germany	29 " "
Caparnagain, Meguerditch Andon	Turkey	15 June "	Dancker, William Henry	- ditto -	20 Nov. "
Calozanni, Constantine Nicholas	Greece	26 " "	Dintelmann, George	- ditto -	24 Dec. "
Cohner, Jacob	Hungary	18 July "	Dracachis, Nicholas Zizimas	Greece	14 Jan. 1874
Cornelipen, Louis	France	14 Aug. "	Delius, Rudolf	Prussia	29 " "
†Caraco, Enrico Diognardi	Italy	17 " "	De Reichel, Balthar	Germany	17 Feb. "
Colombo, Joseph	- ditto -	30 Sept. "	Daron, Charles	France	14 Mar. "
Conquet, Auguste	France	10 Oct. "	De Beer, Josephus Baruchson	Netherlands	8 April "
†Cohen, Benno	Germany	11 " "	De Bary, Carl Wilhelm Rudolph	Germany	9 " "
Capitanas, Starros Panagioti	Ottoman Empire	21 " "	Davies, Henry	- ditto -	28 " "
Crohn, William Bernhard	Sweden	3 Dec. "	De Worms, Solomon Benedict Baron.	- ditto -	18 May "
Canneaux, Jean Baptiste Alfred	France	24 Jan. 1873	Dold, Leopold	- ditto -	24 June "
Cline, Henry	Germany	10 Feb. "	Dunkel, Theodore Joseph	- ditto -	27 " "
Christensen, Carl Peter Emil	Denmark	15 " "	Davis, Lipman	Russia	30 July "
*Caparnagian, Manouk	Turkey	22 " "	Dreher, Julius Alfred	Baden	6 Aug. "
Constol, Adolf	Germany	17 April "	De Bay, Charles Spouyt	Belgium	4 Sept. "
Christodulo, Christo Demetrius	Turkey	8 May "	Dittmar, Jean George	Germany	11 " "
†Carey, James	France	7 June "	Donajowski, Ernest Alexander Adolphe.	France	12 Oct. "
Caspari, Otto	Germany	4 July "	Dormitzer, David	Germany	22 Feb. 1875
Cowles, Edward	United States of America.	11 " "	Didriksen, Jorgen Heitman	Denmark	25 Mar. "
Cording, Ernest Heinrich August	Germany	14 " "	De Abaitna, Juan Baustista	Spain	12 April "
Carah, Francis Michele	Turkey	16 " "	Davies, Solomon	Russia	13 May "
Calderon, Philip Hermogenes	Spain	8 Aug. "	E.		
Chary, Frederick Emil	Germany	17 Oct. "	*Ehrenbach, August	Germany	22 April 1872
Cohn, Maurice	- ditto -	23 Jan. 1874	Eckhaus, Philipp	- ditto -	6 May "
Contsonpiadi, Maxime	Turkey	30 " "	Enbichidi, Nicholas	Greece	19 Aug. "
Cohen, Isaac Jacob	Poland	20 Feb. "	Edlinger, John Ernest	Germany	20 " "
Clauss, Carl	Prussia	27 " "	Ecarius, John George	- ditto -	24 Oct. "
Cohn, Albert	Germany	25 Mar. "	Ehrenbach, Philipp	- ditto -	9 Dec. "
Christensen, Christian	Denmark	27 " "	Ellingsen, Martin Julius	Norway	6 Jan. 1873
Cumella, Tadeo	Spain	13 April "	Ehrlich, Egmont	Germany	16 " "
Cailliatte, Charles Samuel	France	5 May "	Ewald, Louis	- ditto -	21 Mar. "
Clausen, Peter Henry	Germany	1 June "	Ehrhardt, William	- ditto -	14 May "
Carandrea, Nicholas Demetre	Turkey	10 July "	Ellis, Gustav	Prussia	7 June "
Cornelis, Werner	Germany	30 " "	Eliazarian, Sarkis Nihan	Turkey	15 Aug. "
Chabrel, Cyprien Victor	France	25 Aug. "	Eckert, Carl	Germany	27 " "
Caraccio, Joseph	Italy	11 Sept. "	Eberle, Charles George	- ditto -	25 Sept. "
Christmann, George Augustus	Germany	19 Oct. "	Ehrlich, Hermann	Poland	28 Nov. "
Carlavas, David	Greece	28 " "	Eggers, Johan Christian Jacob	Prussia	9 Dec. "
Champion, Ernest Francis Clement.	Egypt	3 Nov. "	Enthoren, Henry	Holland	19 Jan. 1874
Correa, John Numes	Portugal	14 " "	Elliad, Elie Michael	Greece	20 Feb. "
Christensen, Frederick	Germany	26 " "	Elmhorst, Henry	Hanover	24 " "
Cohn, Meyer	- ditto -	9 Dec. "	Ermen, Francis, jun.	Germany	9 May "
Cast, Henry Frederick	- ditto -	22 Jan. 1875	Eckhoff, John	- ditto -	28 Oct. "
Carlstedt, Dagobert Edward Frithrof.	Sweden	29 " "	Eismann, Louis	- ditto -	31 Dec. "
Carlson, Edward	Denmark	12 Mar. "	Eivel, Johannes	- ditto -	13 Jan. 1875
Calmels, Benjamin	France	15 " "	Emanuel, Man	Russia	6 April "
Cazes, Isaac	Morocco	3 April "	Eram, Roupen	Turkey	12 " "
Cababé, Michael	Turkey	23 " "	Essayan, George Agop	- ditto -	28 June "
Carry, Hermann	Germany	18 May "	F.		
Caselberg, Lyons	Russia	18 June "	Friedländer, Edward	Hamburg	25 Mar. 1872
Codina, Joseph	Spain	18 " "	Frane, James	Germany	12 April "
*Clermont, P. A. R. de	Frankfort	6 July "	Franco, Filipe Santiago	Spain	27 May "
D.			Franchet, Henry	France	31 Jan. "
Dolins, Johann Daniel	Prussia	14 Mar. 1872	Funk, Nicholas	Poland	2 July "
Du Boisson, Eugène	France	11 April "	Fleckstein, Charles	Prussia	12 " "
D'Archambaud, Henri	- ditto -	18 " "	Fontana, Baptiste	Switzerland	31 May "
Dunegbier, Hippolyte	- ditto -	30 " "	Florian, Felix	- ditto -	6 Aug. "
*Dehn, Frederick Augustus	Germany	11 May "	Fusban, Albert	Germany	31 Oct. "
Dammers, Alfred William Hounsell.	- ditto -	30 " "			
Durege, Max	- ditto -	10 June "			

* These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

† This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in Her Majesty's Dominions abroad (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

‡ This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in a foreign country (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
Fischer, Frederick	Germany	3 Dec. 1872	Gebhard, Frederick William	Prussia	29 July 1874
Friedlander, Julius	- ditto -	6 Jan. 1873	Gieseke, Carl Heinrich	Germany	4 Sept. "
Fruwirth, Daniel	Austria	17 "	Georgiades, Demetrio	Greece	7 Nov. "
Friedrich, Johann	- ditto -	4 Feb. "	Graesser, Robert Ferdinand	Saxony	10 "
Foa, Octave	France	12 "	Goebbels, Nichola Friedrich	Germany	12 Dec. "
Fischer, Gunther William	Germany	14 "	August.		
Falek, Ernest	- ditto -	22 April "	Germans, Aaron Simon Zalkin	Russia	2 Jan. 1875
Freese, Johann	Prussia	7 May "	Gebhard, Conrad Wilhelm	Bavaria	17 Feb. "
Fremersdorf, William	Germany	31 "	Goas, Charles Frederick Ludwig	Germany	1 Mar. "
†Fretwell, James	Russia	31 "	Gustav.		
Fancquez, Adolphe	France	27 June "	Gerard, Peter	Prussia	3 "
Fecht, Albrecht Edward Richard	Saxony	25 Aug. "	Geider, Frederick	Germany	10 April "
Faber, Philip	Prussia	25 "	Gauz, Franz Xaver	Baden	6 May "
Fraas, Gustavus	Wurtemberg	25 Sept. "	Goldstone, Isaac Harris	Russian Poland	27 "
Fromin, Victor	Prussia	25 "	Grunhut, Jacques	Austria	7 June "
Feige, Charles William Augustus	- ditto -	31 Oct. "	Goldstein, Reuben	Russia	16 "
Fernbach, Solomon	Baden	25 Nov. "	†Goquel, Henrietta Ann	France	9 July "
Farache, Moses Abraham	Morocco	27 "	Gispert, José Reixach y	Spain	20 "
Fecht, Harry Alexander	Saxony	28 "			
Faust, Carl	Germany	9 Feb. 1874	H.		
Fuich von der, Louis	Holland	20 "	Hornberger, Isidor	Germany	2 April 1872
Figorski, John	Poland	25 April "	*Hinzmann, John Michael Freder- rick.	Wurtemberg	2 "
Frommann, Valentine	Germany	28 "	Horner, Emil	Switzerland	11 "
Felber, Jean	Switzerland	4 May "	Hirschfeld, Henry	Austria	3 May "
Freund, Hermann	Germany	29 "	Heyn, Justus	Germany	6 "
Fries, Martin	- ditto -	30 June "	Hettish, Simon	- ditto -	23 "
Fuchs, Philipp	Prussia	21 July "	Hettish, Frederick	- ditto -	23 "
Fussell, Maria Mary	Switzerland	19 Sept. "	Henbach, Louis	- ditto -	31 "
Fiedler, Robert Rudolph Oscar	Germany	12 Nov. "	Huber, Charles Julius	Bavaria	31 Aug. "
Ferneine, Alexander Joseph	Turkey	18 "	*Hirsch, Jacob Francis	- ditto -	1 Oct. "
Fein, Herman William Chris- topher.	Germany	20 "	Hamborg, Herman Olsen	Norway	17 "
Fais, Joseph	- ditto -	7 Dec. "	Husted, Henrik Frederick	Denmark	12 Nov. "
Forslind, Charles Albert	Sweden	29 Jan. 1875	Heggum, Edward Carl Wilhelm	- ditto -	20 "
Fuglistaller, Julius	Switzerland	5 Feb. "	*Haarbleicher, Meir Jacob	Germany	6 Dec. "
Fulda, Sylvester	Germany	17 "	Hamburg, Charles	- ditto -	31 "
Fernandez, Vitale	Turkey	3 May "	Heiz, Joseph	- ditto -	10 Jan. 1873
Frercko, Johann Hinrich	Prussia	27 July "	Haarbleicher, Frederick	- ditto -	17 "
G.			Haugk, Charles Edward Frederick	- ditto -	31 "
Grenier, Gotthelf	Germany	28 Mar. 1872	Hakowski, Joseph	Poland	1 Feb. "
Goldberg, Nathan	Russia	30 April "	*Henlé, Louis Anthony	Prussia	15 "
Gomez, Frans	France	11 June "	Henk, Francis	Germany	5 Mar. "
Goldberger, Rudolph	Hungary	18 "	Hildesheimer, Siegmund	- ditto -	12 "
Gomez, Juan	Portugal	29 "	Hoffman, Moritz	Russia	31 "
Geshoff, John Eustratieff	Turkey	2 July "	*Hecht, Augustus Daniel	Germany	2 April "
Gutanag, Abraham Isaac	Russia	31 "	Hencke, Johann Hermann	Prussia	14 "
Guillemin, Augustin	France	8 Aug. "	Holtz, Abraham	Russia	15 "
Gollmer, Charles Andrew	Wurtemberg	13 Sept. "	Hidoeghy, Sigmund	Austria	10 May "
Goldberg, Abraham	Prussia	26 "	Hecht, Solomon	Germany	16 "
Good, Max	Baden	7 Nov. "	Hara, Peter	Turkey	31 "
Gardère, John	France	9 Dec. "	Herman, David	Austria	31 "
Goldman, Isaac	Russia	12 "	Hirsch, Oscar Maurice William	Holland	31 "
Gausler, Michael Louis	Wurtemberg	13 "	Hecht, Maximilian Sebastian	Germany	7 June "
*Gonzalez, Joseph	Spain	31 "	Haas, Gustave Adolphe	Prussia	7 "
Geber, George Ferdinand Moritz	Germany	24 Jan. 1873	Hofbauer, George Karl Martin	Germany	27 "
Geber, Moritz	- ditto -	10 Feb. "	Hinck, Caroline Johanne Mag- delene.	Hanover	8 July "
Guesus, Hadji Elarbe	Morocco	11 "	Hammereister, Heinrich Freder- rick.	Prussia	19 "
Gripari, John Peter	Greece	15 "	Heine, Harry	Hanover	22 "
Guillon, Pierre	France	19 "	Hoeffert, Henry Adolpf	Prussia	8 Aug. "
Goering, Francis William George Albert.	Germany	22 Mar. "	Herf, Carl Oscar	- ditto -	6 Oct. "
Growing, Henry	- ditto -	26 "	Hervmann, Louis	Bavaria	8 "
Grimaldi, Constantine George	Greece	3 April "	Habrias, Francis	France	14 "
Graeff, Friedrich August	Prussia	16 "	Heng, Louis	Prussia	27 "
Gfrörer, Herman Frederik	Germany	21 "	Hornann, Heinrich Wilhelm	Germany	31 "
Goldsteine, Jacob	Russia	21 June "	*Hazzopulo, Sotivios	Greece	13 Dec. "
Goldsmith, Lipmann	Prussia	8 Aug. "	Heitmann, Friedrich	Germany	16 "
Graf, Charles Frederick	Wurtemberg	19 "	Héron, Francios	France	28 Jan. 1874
Grover, Bernard	Austria	2 Oct. "	Hartenstein, Jacques	- ditto -	26 Mar. "
Geronthus, Geronzi Bertero	Italy	24 "	Henser, Balthasar	Germany	15 April "
Granberg, Johan Frederic	Russia	28 Nov. "	Hildebrandt, Albert	- ditto -	5 May "
Goldbard, Harman	- ditto -	8 Jan. 1874	*Hoffmann, Achior	Switzerland	13 "
Goldstone, Morris	- ditto -	19 "	*Hildesheim, Hermann	Hamburg	3 June "
Gamain, Alexander	France	19 "	Hattich, Leopold	Baden	6 "
Goldberg, Bernard	Russian Poland	23 "	*Hallé, Charles Frederick	Prussia	13 July "
Gorfunkle, Samuel	Russia	3 Feb. "	Hallé, Charles Emil	France	13 "
Gaddum, George Henry	Austria	20 "	Hartmann, William E. A.	Germany	27 "
Günther, Albert Charles Lewis Gotthief.	Germany	7 Mar. "	Hallberg, Petronella	Sweden	28 "
Glasstone, Simon	Russia	22 April "	Henser, Daniel	Germany	28 "
Gutmann, August	Baden	27 "	Harris, Hille Lippmann	Russia	19 Aug. "
Grinberg, Morris	Russian Poland	12 May "	Holsten, Hinrich	Hanover	25 "
Gumushguerdan, Krikor	Turkey	8 June "	Herlich, Joseph	Germany	14 Sept. "
Gartman, Rudolph	Austria	17 "	Hart, Solomon	Russia	7 Oct. "
Giesser, George Guillaume	Switzerland	30 "	Herrmann, Ernest	Germany	13 "
Groenings, Franz	Germany	11 July "	Hoier, Hans Waldar Emil	Norway	24 "
Goldstein, Harris	Russia	14 "	Heyman, Herrman Solomon	Sweden	18 Nov. "
Gelineck, Charles H. P.	Germany	18 "	Heyder, George Theodore Von	Germany	26 "
Gunster, Carl August	- ditto -	27 "	Haas, Maximilian, otherwise Moses.	- ditto -	20 Jan. 1875

* These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

† These are certificates of re-admission to British Nationality under the Act of 1870.

† This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in a foreign country (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

RETURN OF CERTIFICATES OF NATURALISATION

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
Hepp, John Joseph - - -	Germany - - -	22 Jan. 1875	Lafittan, Mathien (commonly called Victor Mathien Lafittan).	France - - -	17 May 1872
Hecking, Charles Julius - -	- ditto - - -	18 Feb. "	Ludwig, Maximilian - - -	Germany - - -	27 " "
Hartje, Frederick Henry William	- ditto - - -	24 " "	Lindwall, Bengt Magnus - -	Sweden - - -	31 " "
Heckmann, Joseph - - -	- ditto - - -	26 " "	Lutz, Anton - - -	Bavaria - - -	26 June "
Heymans, Siegfried Louis - -	Holland - - -	3 Mar. "	Latoix, Louis - - -	Switzerland - - -	24 July "
Hoecker, Hermann Johann Christian.	Germany - - -	3 April "	Lion, Emanuel - - -	Metz - - -	19 Aug. "
Hendrichs, Frank Hubert - -	- ditto - - -	8 May "	Lubke, Cristoph Theodor - -	Prussia - - -	9 Oct. "
Harden, Henry - - -	- ditto - - -	19 " "	Leveine, Isaac - - -	Russia - - -	10 " "
Heiz, Naphtali - - -	Russia - - -	7 June "	Leopold, August - - -	Germany - - -	18 " "
Heinemann, George - - -	Germany - - -	9 " "	Lotz, Arthur - - -	- ditto - - -	24 " "
Hirsch, Frederick William Richard	- ditto - - -	9 July "	Lapmann, Ernest Johannes -	- ditto - - -	28 " "
Hoistendoh, Hans - - -	Norway - - -	21 " "	Lenw, Levy - - -	Holland - - -	20 Nov. "
I. and J.			Lentner, Albert - - -	Prussia - - -	30 " "
Jensen, Philip - - -	Germany - - -	18 April 1872	Lion, Mauritz - - -	Holland - - -	9 Dec. "
Isaac, David - - -	Prussia - - -	28 May "	Liot, Edwin - - -	France - - -	18 Jan. 1873
Joseph, Davis - - -	Russian Poland - - -	28 " "	*Loewenstein, David - - -	Prussia - - -	12 Feb. "
*Isauck, Montz - - -	Germany - - -	28 " "	Loog, Hermann - - -	Germany - - -	6 Mar. "
Jacobson, Lewis Jacob - - -	Netherlands - - -	29 June "	Luks, Henry William Baldwin -	- ditto - - -	25 April "
*Jonas, Benjamin Julius - -	Germany - - -	10 Aug. "	Lenke, Albert Louis - - -	- ditto - - -	25 " "
Jolly, Anthony - - -	- ditto - - -	3 Dec. "	Leoinstein, Ivan - - -	- ditto - - -	25 " "
Junker, Maurice - - -	Prussia - - -	14 April 1873	Leveson, Alfred Rudolph - -	Prussia - - -	20 May "
*Jacoby, Ernest - - -	Germany - - -	22 " "	Loech, William - - -	Wurtemberg - - -	9 June "
Jacchi, Francis - - -	Italy - - -	25 June "	Loewenthal, Edward - - -	Germany - - -	16 " "
Joseph, Alexander Gedalje - -	Prussia - - -	14 Oct. "	Lotinga, Mozes - - -	Netherlands - - -	16 " "
Jacobs, Leopold Gustav - - -	Russia - - -	31 " "	Larquet, Lucien - - -	France - - -	18 " "
Jastorebski, Stephen Louis - -	Austria - - -	6 Nov. "	Laloe, Augustus Felix Emile -	- ditto - - -	21 " "
*Jachim, Henry - - -	- ditto - - -	17 Feb. 1874	Lefranc, Francois - - -	- ditto - - -	21 " "
Jacobs, Isaac - - -	Russia - - -	20 " "	Larderich, Charles Henri - -	- ditto - - -	30 " "
Just, Heinrich Wolfgang - - -	Wurtemberg - - -	24 April "	Levy, Jacob David - - -	Hamburg - - -	8 July "
Imbrey, Charles - - -	Germany - - -	27 " "	Luhtenberg, Abraham - - -	Russian Poland - - -	22 " "
Johannes, Karl (Hesse-Homburg)	- ditto - - -	17 Aug. "	Latte, William - - -	Prussia - - -	24 " "
*Jacobs, Carl Christian Adolphe -	- ditto - - -	15 Dec. "	Lemaire, Alfred Bernard - -	France - - -	23 Oct. "
Jervelund, Carl Andreas Christian	Denmark - - -	29 Jan. 1875	Leho, John - - -	Austria - - -	24 " "
Jelman, Charles - - -	Germany - - -	3 Feb. "	Lindell, Severin Julius - - -	Sweden - - -	24 " "
Jacobowicz, Fabian - - -	Russia - - -	6 April "	Leoni, Ottmar - - -	Bavaria - - -	28 Nov. "
Jaeger, Ludwig Wilhelm Fried- rich.	Germany - - -	6 May "	*Levy Sabbato - - -	Greece - - -	28 " "
Jaffe, Alfred - - -	- ditto - - -	11 June "	Lucovich, John - - -	Egypt - - -	5 Dec. "
Jolowicz, Hermann - - -	- ditto - - -	18 " "	Lessing, Adolphe - - -	Bavaria - - -	8 Jan. 1874
K.			Leidhold, Julius - - -	Germany - - -	13 " "
Keller, Franz Peter - - -	Bavaria - - -	31 May 1872	Leipziger, Seigfried - - -	Silesia - - -	31 " "
Kottger, Gustavus Adolphus - -	Germany - - -	29 June "	Lalanne, Henry - - -	Spain - - -	10 Mar. "
Klungler, William Henry Edward	- ditto - - -	8 July "	Lüdeke, Johann Ernst Friedrich	Hanover - - -	13 " "
Klein, Julius - - -	- ditto - - -	15 " "	Loeffler, Philipp Esaias - - -	Germany - - -	24 " "
Koch, Guido Tuisko - - -	Saxony - - -	22 " "	Leipziger, Oscar - - -	Silesia - - -	25 " "
Klaassen, Hinderikus Martinus -	Prussia - - -	23 " "	Lottkowitz, Heinrich Wilhelm August.	Germany - - -	12 May "
Kling, Joseph - - -	- ditto - - -	8 Aug. "	Lingner, Wilhelm - - -	- ditto - - -	29 " "
Kop, Alexander - - -	Denmark - - -	26 Oct. "	Lowenstein, Leopold Adolph -	- ditto - - -	15 June "
Krausse, Adolph - - -	Germany - - -	26 " "	Ludolph, Louis - - -	- ditto - - -	19 " "
Krolle, Franz Frederick Christian	Saxony - - -	16 Nov. "	Liddle, John Jacob - - -	- ditto - - -	22 " "
Koesters, Gerardus - - -	Holland - - -	26 " "	Lansing, Moses - - -	United States of America -	29 " "
Koebel, Arthur Frederick - - -	Wurtemberg - - -	28 " "	Linch, Edward F. C. - - -	Prussia - - -	23 July "
Kramer, Frederick - - -	- ditto - - -	23 Dec. "	Lacy de, Charles Edy - - -	Holland - - -	21 Aug. "
Korner, Johann Baptist - - -	Germany - - -	26 Feb. 1873	Longren, Lawrentz Philip - -	Sweden - - -	19 Sept. "
Karamelli, Leo William - - -	Prussia - - -	12 Mar. "	Laudenbacher, Sigmund - - -	Germany - - -	24 " "
Kohn, Rudolf - - -	Austria - - -	19 " "	Labhart, Frederick - - -	- ditto - - -	10 Oct. "
Kullmann, Wilhelm - - -	Germany - - -	25 April "	Le Prince, Joseph Louis - - -	France - - -	24 " "
Keller, Carl - - -	Prussia - - -	30 June "	Lewey, Joseph - - -	Germany - - -	20 Nov. "
Kossmann, Eugene - - -	France - - -	19 Aug. "	Lewey, Philip - - -	- ditto - - -	20 " "
Kanvell, Lewis - - -	Russia - - -	6 Oct. "	Lowenstein, George Sally Marcus	- ditto - - -	7 Dec. "
Knechtie, John - - -	Switzerland - - -	25 Nov. "	Lorentz, Frederick William - -	- ditto - - -	5 Jan. 1875
Kaufmann, Adolph - - -	Russia - - -	9 Feb. 1874	Lund, Jens - - -	Norway - - -	8 Feb. "
Kramer, John Baptist Baltasar Edward.	Germany - - -	3 Mar. "	*Lunge, George - - -	Prussia - - -	25 " "
Krönig, Friedrich Wilhelm Carl -	- ditto - - -	20 April "	*Loewenthal, Julius - - -	Mecklenburg-Schwerin -	27 " "
Kohlhausen, John Daniel - - -	- ditto - - -	27 " "	Levita, Henry Joseph Edward -	Germany - - -	6 April "
Keiffenheim, Alfred - - -	- ditto - - -	1 June "	Labelleville, Louis de - - -	France - - -	7 " "
Karam, Joseph - - -	Ottoman Empire - - -	12 June "	Lassaletta, Mariano - - -	Spain - - -	13 " "
Klett, Ferdinand Alexander - -	Germany - - -	4 July "	Lüdke, Richard Oscar Gustav -	Germany - - -	17 " "
*Kessler, Julius - - -	Prussia - - -	13 " "	Lehmann, Edward Sigismund -	- ditto - - -	8 May "
Krotoski, Michael - - -	Russia - - -	26 Sept. "	Lehmann, Robert Adolph - - -	- ditto - - -	8 " "
Karamelli, Hugo - - -	Germany - - -	10 Oct. "	Leroy, Ferdinand - - -	Belgium - - -	10 " "
Kreyer, Johann Friedrich Chris- tian.	- ditto - - -	26 " "	Lederer, Conrad Koppleman -	Austria - - -	27 " "
Knuppel, Wilhelm - - -	- ditto - - -	2 Nov. "	Leuchters, Charles Henry - -	Prussia - - -	16 June "
Klumpp, Johan Jacob - - -	- ditto - - -	1 Dec. "	†Lorentz, Hermann Melchoir -	Finland - - -	25 " "
Karuth, Frank Oscar - - -	- ditto - - -	10 " "	Lauria, Christian Lazarus - -	Prussia - - -	30 " "
Klep, Johann Carl - - -	- ditto - - -	9 Feb. 1875	*Lipschitz, Selig - - -	Russia - - -	7 July "
Klep, Johann Nicholas - - -	- ditto - - -	9 " "	M.		
Kocsis, Alexander - - -	Austria - - -	14 June "	Maas, Bernhard - - -	Bavaria - - -	16 April 1872
L.			Miller, Henry - - -	Holland - - -	30 " "
Lobeck, Karl Ernst August - -	Germany - - -	9 April 1872	Maas, Sigismund - - -	Bavaria - - -	31 May "
Lersch, Heinrich - - -	- ditto - - -	24 " "	Meister, Frederick - - -	Germany - - -	19 June "
Laniado, Isaac - - -	Turkey - - -	3 May "	*Marash, Abdoulah - - -	Turkey - - -	11 July "
Leurson, Jacob - - -	Prussia - - -	4 " "	Marconteh, Moscho - - -	- ditto - - -	17 " "
Landbach, John Philip - - -	Germany - - -	11 " "	Michaelides, Cleanthes - - -	- ditto - - -	27 " "
			Meroni, Paul - - -	Italy - - -	16 Sept. "
			Mirzayantz, Simon - - -	Russia - - -	9 Oct. "
			Mark, Gustav Adolph Ernst -	Bavaria - - -	21 " "

* These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

† This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in a foreign country (Naturalization Act, 1870).

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
Ménage, Gustave Eugene -	France -	21 Oct. 1872	O.		
Ménage, Jean Baptiste Auguste -	- ditto -	21 " "	Ouvrarel, John -	France -	17 April 1872
Müller, John James -	Germany -	14 Nov. "	Oppenheimer, Hermann -	Netherlands -	17 June "
Martinez, Ivan Maria Rafael -	Spain -	9 Dec. "	Oppenheim, Sigismund -	Germany -	2 July "
Marx, Julius Alexander Maria -	Germany -	10 Jan. 1873	Oppert, Gustav -	- ditto -	14 Oct. "
Maerteus, Ferdinand Edward -	Prussia -	27 " "	Ohaniantz, Charles -	Russia -	20 Nov. "
Mensing, Louis Carl Heinrich -	Germany -	22 Feb. "	Osbeck, Peter -	Sweden -	29 May 1873
Meyer, Julius -	- ditto -	6 Mar. "	Ostle, Gottlob -	Germany -	31 July "
Moore, Michael Miller -	United States of America -	28 Mar. "	Oppenheim, Simon -	- ditto -	29 Sept. "
Morro, Leopold -	Germany -	3 April "	Otil, Felix Adam -	Bavaria -	24 Oct. "
Meyer, Hartwig -	- ditto -	9 " "	Oswalt, Alfred Ludwig -	Germany -	8 Nov. "
Martinucci, Antonio -	Italy -	16 " "	Oppenheimer, Adolphe -	Prussia -	27 " "
Mensch, Isaac Leo -	Austria -	25 " "	Oexle, William George Adolphus -	Italy -	2 Dec. "
Maffert, Heinrich -	Germany -	9 May "	Oglu, Kesis Xenophon -	Russia -	28 Jan. 1874
Mayer, Emil -	Baden -	10 " "	Ommundsen, Adolph -	Norway -	4 Feb. "
Mankowski, Casimir Ignace -	Austria -	31 " "	Orsi, Giuseppe Angelo -	Italy -	10 " "
Mendl, Jacques -	- ditto -	31 " "	*Oppenheim, Gustavus Adolphus -	Frankfort -	2 July "
Mamlock, Leonard Charles -	Russian Poland -	9 June "	Oberbach, John George -	Germany -	5 Oct. "
Meltzer, Christoph Reinhold -	Russia -	8 July "	Oldendorff, Ludolph Heinrich -	- ditto -	11 Dec. "
Meyer, Theodore -	Prussia -	10 " "	Otto, Emil Friedrich Wilhelm -	Prussia -	23 Mar. 1875
Meyer, Johann Carl Heinrich -	Germany -	19 " "	Obegi, Anthony Fathalla -	Turkey -	17 April "
Mentasti, Enrico -	Italy -	31 " "			
Moraitini, Nicholas Antonio -	Austria -	15 Aug. "	P.		
Mallgraf, John Jacob -	Denmark -	1 Sept. "	*Posselt, Ernest -	Baden -	2 April 1872
Maas, Louis Otho Philip -	Prussia -	5 " "	Proust, Pierre -	France -	26 " "
Meyer, Max Leopold -	Belgium -	20 " "	Prager, Henry -	Prussia -	11 May "
Mustapha, Mustapha -	Persia -	30 " "	Petersen, Peter Andreas -	Denmark -	26 June "
Moritz, Hermann Rudolph -	Prussia -	6 Oct. "	Pasch, Salomon Bernhard -	Prussia -	2 July "
Markus, Joseph Levy -	Germany -	20 " "	*Passadoro, Giuseppe Bonifacio -	Italy -	22 " "
Machn, Julius Peter John -	France -	17 Nov. "	Perken, Louis Edmond -	France -	23 " "
Marras, Graanto -	Italy -	19 " "	Pfeiffer, George -	Wurtemberg -	21 Sept. "
Mendl, Ferdinand -	Bohemia -	2 Dec. "	Pfeiffer, Friedrich -	- ditto -	23 " "
Meyer, Moritz -	Germany -	5 " "	Petersen, Peter -	Norway -	31 Oct. "
Mohrmann, Johann -	Hanover -	9 " "	Patzner, Charles Christian Frederick Robert -	Germany -	5 Nov. "
Mussalli, Youssef Antoon -	Turkey -	8 Jan. 1874	Peterson, John -	Denmark -	12 Feb. 1873
Myers, Joseph -	Russia -	14 " "	Piedune, Jean Raimond -	France -	7 June "
Meyer, Louis -	Hanover -	24 Feb. "	Podesta, Antonio -	Italy -	4 July "
Michael, Solomon -	Prussia -	27 " "	Potocki, Albert Stanislaus -	Poland -	16 " "
Matatia, Elia -	Turkey -	12 Mar. "	Ploetz, Richard Adolph -	Russia -	15 Aug. "
Meyer, Julius -	Denmark -	8 April "	Pollack, Oscar -	Germany -	27 " "
Müller, Anthony -	Austria -	10 " "	Pfeiffer, Charles -	Wurtemberg -	27 " "
Meyer, Emile -	Belgium -	17 " "	Pando, Theodore George -	Turkey -	6 Sept. "
Maranian, Manouk -	Turkey -	1 May "	Pohlmann, Nicholas Friedrich Wilhelm -	Germany -	6 " "
Michaeloff, Stat Stephen -	- ditto -	25 " "	Petersen, Theodor Wilhelm -	Prussia -	17 Oct. "
Malvido, Adolfo Serafin -	Spain -	26 " "	Porges, Jacob -	Austria -	29 " "
Mormina, Frank -	Italy -	26 " "	Petersen, Theodor Wilhelm -	Prussia -	8 Nov. "
Müller, Henry -	Schleswig -	1 June "	Politi, Victor -	Greece -	17 " "
Meyer, Jacob Lorenz -	Hamburg -	3 " "	Porinski, Samuel M. -	Russia -	20 " "
Morlock, Charles Gustave -	Germany -	24 " "	Pain, Leopold -	Austria -	13 Dec. "
Möller, Hans Ludwig -	Norway -	29 " "	Ploek, Gottfried -	Prussia -	13 Jan. 1874
Möller, Charles Fred Zenthen -	Denmark -	18 Aug. "	Portheim, Moritz -	Mecklenburg Strelitz -	4 Feb. "
Meyer, Friedrich Adolph -	Bremen -	22 " "	Passavant, August Ferdinand -	Prussia -	20 " "
Meltzer, Diedrich Hermann -	Russia -	7 Sept. "	Paiva, de Amelia Perara -	Portugal -	24 " "
Michaëlis, Philip -	Netherlands -	16 Nov. "	Paetow, Frederick Cesar -	Hamburg -	14 Mar. "
Mettlerkamp, George Edward -	Germany -	27 " "	Ponzono, Ottavio -	Italy -	22 April "
Mayer, Joseph -	Turkey -	28 " "	Passawer, Ernest -	Russia -	28 May "
Meltzer, Hermann -	Germany -	28 " "	Paspatti, Michel Filipe -	Austria -	1 June "
Moll, Frederick Henry Ludwig Raphael -	- ditto -	3 Dec. "	Pollitzer, Sigismund -	- ditto -	20 July "
Mundagnialidi, Eustratius Geogre -	Turkey -	7 " "	Principe, Arturo -	Spain -	29 Aug. "
Meyer, Nicolas -	France -	14 Jan. 1875	Primavesi, Archidoro Pompeo -	Italy -	23 Sept. "
Morris, Aaron -	Russia -	5 Mar. "	Primavesi, Guilio Cesare -	- ditto -	23 " "
Müller, Hermann -	Germany -	19 " "	Papazian, James -	Turkey -	24 " "
Martinengo, Joseph -	- ditto -	8 April "	Pech, Franz -	Germany -	20 Nov. "
Mazzantini, Amalia Maria Elvira -	Italy -	27 " "	Progatzky, Henry -	- ditto -	9 Dec. "
Maier, Julius Jacob -	Germany -	18 May "	Phillips, Isaac -	- ditto -	29 Jan. 1875
Manero, Alejandro Antonio -	Spain -	10 June "	Potocki, Mieczslas François Joseph -	Russia -	6 Feb. "
Mark, Hermann -	Germany -	28 " "			
			Pfeifer, Julius -	Germany -	17 Mar. "
N.			Partenschlager, Joseph -	- ditto -	21 May "
Newmark, Paul -	Germany -	19 June 1872	Pennrich, Edward Julius -	- ditto -	10 June "
Noumann, Christian Otto -	Saxony -	6 July "	Packness, Jens Christian Boegh -	Denmark -	11 " "
Nestle, Christian -	Wurtemberg -	26 Sept. "	Pavy, Eugene -	France -	24 " "
Naggiar, Felue -	Egypt -	5 Oct. "	Polisachi, Constantine -	Turkey -	28 " "
Newmann, Ernst -	Germany -	9 Dec. "	Pauer, Carl Wullbrand -	Prussia -	14 July "
Neuberger, Siegfried Louis -	Bavaria -	14 " "	Piaccio, Nicola -	Italy -	16 " "
Nortem, Oscar -	Prussia -	19 Feb. 1873			
Nestle, George David -	Wurtemberg -	14 May "	Q.		
Nisson, Alfred Hakon Engelstoft -	Denmark -	25 June "	Nil.		
Nino, John Baptist -	Spain -	31 Oct. "	R.		
Nissler, John Adam -	Wurtemberg -	31 " "	Ronger, Isan Ovide Albert -	France -	30 April 1872
Nassif, Nicolas -	Egypt -	13 Dec. "	*Rolfo, Charles Frederick -	Germany -	30 " "
Nadel, Elias -	Austria -	20 April 1874	Reger, Emil -	Prussia -	31 May "
Nacoz, Gabriel -	Turkey -	29 June "	Radigue, Victor Pierre -	France -	17 June "
Nyberg, Charles George -	Sweden -	3 Aug. "	Rock, Carl Edward -	Wurtemberg -	17 " "
Nathan, John -	Germany -	28 Oct. "	Risch, Carl Hermann Gustav -	Germany -	23 July "
Nave, Joseph -	Austria -	8 Feb. 1875	Robinson, Carl Siegmund -	- ditto -	6 Aug. "
Nissler, John William -	Germany -	25 " "	Roos, Georg Carl Wilhelm -	- ditto -	8 Nov. "
Nothwanger, Robert Charles -	- ditto -	8 June "			

* These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

RETURN OF CERTIFICATES OF NATURALISATION

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
Ralli, Ambrose John Constantine	France	12 Nov. 1872	Spero, Wolfe Marcus	Russia	14 Jan. 1874
Reicherter, Auguste	Germany	13 Dec. "	*Steinfeld, Abraham Moses	Prussia	14 "
Reimers, Johann Wilhelm Diedrich	- ditto	23 "	Schwabacher, Michael	Bavaria	28 "
Reichenbach, Louis	Austria	31 "	Schmidt, Frederick Henry Ernest	Germany	9 Feb. "
Ronsen, Saul	Russian Poland	31 "	*Stoehr, Emil Moritz	- ditto	10 "
Radestock, Albert	Prussia	17 Mar. 1873	Schilizzi, Demetrius Stefanovich	Tuscany	27 "
Rupp, Oscar	Wurttemberg	14 July "	Stamm, Hermann	Germany	3 Mar. "
Roessler, Julius	Frankfort-on-Maine	14 "	Schulze, Paul Guido	- ditto	16 "
Reingann, Eugene Edward	- ditto	8 Aug. "	Scharban, John Joachim Henry	- ditto	18 "
Rees, Charles Joseff	Prussia	29 Sept. "	Simon, Conrad	Hamburg	25 "
Ruchon, Thomas Robert	France	13 Nov. "	Schuler, Joachim	Baden	1 April "
Rapp, Michael	Frankfort-on-Maine	14 April 1874	Stonsapir, Jacob	Russia	6 "
Rupp, John Justus	Germany	28 "	Simon, Emil	Germany	8 "
Reichman, Solomon	Russian Poland	12 May "	Siert, Hans George	- ditto	8 "
*Roggio, Stephen	Italy	16 July "	Serena, Arthur Daniel	Belgium	14 "
Roche, Henry Stanley	Saxony	20 "	§Scharfnesser, Moses	Galicia	9 May "
Raimo, Alberto	Italy	21 "	Schneider, William	Germany	13 "
Rosenfeld, Emilie Henriette	Russia	21 Sept. "	Suchsland, Rudolph	- ditto	27 July "
Ritter, Joseph	Germany	26 "	*Silber, Albert Marcius	Denmark	5 Aug. "
Rothfeld, Louis	Hungary	14 Nov. "	Schwabacher, Leopold	Austria	26 "
Rother, Carl Robert	Germany	28 "	Siewert, John George	Russia	26 "
Rombach, Mathias	- ditto	10 Dec. "	Seeman, Charles Christian	Denmark	29 "
Rizzi, Angelo Sereno	Italy	22 Jan. 1875	Schumann, Hermann Jacob	Germany	29 "
Rathmann, Christian	Germany	28 "	*Sallon, Julius Frederiek	Denmark	7 Sept. "
Rottger, Georg Rudolph Wilhelm	- ditto	29 "	Seiders, Edmund Joshua	United States of America	14 "
Runge, Johann Heinrich	- ditto	13 Feb. "	Slapoffski, Marcus Eleazer Ert	Holland	22 "
Friedrich Christoph (otherwise Henry Runge).	France	27 "	*Souhami, Alphonse Abraham	Turkey	30 "
Roussey, Louis Emile	Austria	24 Mar. "	Stumpp, Otto	Germany	30 "
Redlich, Heinrich	- ditto	19 May "	Strauss, Gustavus	- ditto	9 Oct. "
Reischer, Hirsch	France	2 June "	Sjoberg, Carl Waldemar	Sweden	16 "
Rousseau, Albert Philemon	Switzerland	12 "	Swab, Edward Wilson	Germany	24 "
Reif, Gean Charles	Germany	14 "	Siese, William	- ditto	11 Nov. "
Roederer, Arthur	Germany	23 "	Sorenson, Peter Julius	Denmark	14 "
Roussin, Louis	Greece	16 July "	Schwab, William	Germany	16 "
Rothschild, Henry	Germany	16 July "	Schultz, George	- ditto	17 "
S.			Schwarck, Diedrich	- ditto	17 "
Szapira, Jacob	Russia	27 Mar. 1872	Schuberth, Edward Charles	Russia	14 Dec. "
*Seavamanga, Colo George	Greece	11 April "	Steffen, Otto	Germany	19 Jan. 1875
Satow, Jochim Theodor	Russia	15 "	Schäfer, Jakob Wilhelm	- ditto	29 "
Simmons, Abraham	Poland	17 "	Schwarzschild, Jacob	- ditto	30 "
Schumann, Emile	France	19 "	Stiebel, Bernard Franz	- ditto	22 Feb. "
Strube, Carl Frederick Theodore	Mecklenburg Schwerin	30 Nov. "	Schluter, Charles	- ditto	24 "
*Steinthal, Gustavus	Germany	10 May "	Scheel, Heinrich Daniel Wilhelm	Prussia	3 Mar. "
§Sichtart, John Godfrey	- ditto	28 "	Schleicher, Otto	Germany	10 "
Simon, George	- ditto	7 June "	Schintz, Hans Caspar	Switzerland	17 "
Schaefer, Henry Frederick Francis	- ditto	17 "	Schmid, Henry Ernest	Germany	6 April "
†Schmid, Karl Edward	Switzerland	18 July "	Sprinz, William	- ditto	12 "
Schloss, Louis	Prussia	19 Aug. "	Struthman, Herman	- ditto	29 "
Simonnaire, Louis Joseph	Strasbourg	10 Sept. "	Steger, Daniel Maurice	- ditto	7 May "
Schade, Frederick von Urvyhg	Prussia	20 "	Steiner, Charles David	- ditto	21 "
Stima, Giulio	Italy	11 Oct. "	Schott, Robert Nicholas John	- ditto	24 "
Schierenberg, Edward	Germany	28 Nov. "	Straube, Gustav	- ditto	25 "
*Seligmann, Hermann	Mecklenburg Schwerin	6 Dec. "	Schmidt, Ludwig Wilhelm	- ditto	4 June "
Sawan, Jeseeph Fadlallah	Turkey	23 "	Schaeffer, Anton Georg	Prussia	4 "
*Souhami, Elias	- ditto	11 Jan. 1873	Schuster, Ernest Joseph	Germany	11 "
Soloweyczyk, Simon Elias	Russia	11 Feb. "	Schuster, Arthur	- ditto	11 "
Strauss, William	Germany	11 "	Schuster, Felix Otto	- ditto	11 "
Sington, Julius Theodor	Hamburg	21 "	Schuster, Francis Joseph	- ditto	11 "
Salomon, Aaron	Germany	12 Mar. "	Simon, Max Julius	- ditto	16 "
*Strauss, Siegfried	- ditto	21 "	Stromier, Joseph	Baden	17 "
Sagranti, Pandeli John	Greece	31 "	T.		
Sacke, Simon	Russia	9 April "	Triantafyllo, Demosthenes	Greece	30 April 1872
Sevastopulo, Michael Alexander	Turkey	16 "	*Tucker, John	Turkey	31 May "
Schroeder, Johan Wilhelm Constantin.	Sweden	30 "	Tessier, Eugene Louis	France	5 Aug. "
Scheibner, Charles	Saxony	7 May "	Teichert, Johann Carl Godfried	Germany	4 Nov. "
Stein, Otto Julius	Germany	7 "	Tomel, Germain Emmanuel	France	27 Jan. 1873
Stratz, Louis	- ditto	9 "	Taigel, George	Germany	21 Feb. "
Siemms, Adolphe Isaac	- ditto	21 "	Tranel, Louis	Switzerland	24 Mar. "
Solomon, Lewis	Austria	31 "	Toboul, Ibrahim	Algiers	14 April "
*Schemel, Emin	Ottoman Empire	31 "	Tourret, Erneste	France	11 July "
Schmerl, Simon	Prussia	7 June "	Tamet, Dominique	- ditto	8 Aug. "
Spiegelthal, Friedrich Wilhelm Johannes.	- ditto	16 "	Tavernier, Louis Ferdinand	- ditto	15 "
Steinhaner, David	Austria	18 "	Thomar, Heinrich August Moritz	Nassau	25 "
Smagberger, Adolph	Hungary	25 "	*Tambari, Paul	Ionian Islands	14 Oct. "
Stahl, Joseph Lorenz Hubert	Prussia	30 "	Thürning, Adam	Hesse Darmstadt	27 "
*Semon, Charles Samuel Joseph	- ditto	10 July "	Touron, Auguste Joseph	France	8 Jan. 1874
Schreurs, Jean Antoine	Holland	26 "	Thibaudan, Alphonse Louis	- ditto	10 Feb. "
†Smith, James Floyd	Hamburg	9 Aug. "	Ernest Wyatt.		
†Smith, George Purves	- ditto	9 "	Tedeschi, Zaveri Amadio	Switzerland	23 May "
†Smith, Peter	- ditto	31 July "	Tarelli, Matthew	Italy	2 June "
*Spartali, Ovanes Esayi	Turkey	25 Aug. "	Thiersch, Ludwig Auguste	Bavaria	18 Aug. "
Steen, Henry Aaron	Germany	10 Sept. "	Timannus, Charles Frederick	Germany	29 Oct. "
Stein, Edward Albert	Hanover	14 Oct. "	Erdmann.		
Summerfield, Israel	Germany	23 "	Tuck, Raphael	- ditto	30 Jan. 1875
Schaepfi, John James	Switzerland	24 "	Tritsch, Jacob	Hungary	19 Feb. "
Susman, Josef	Germany	13 Nov. "	Thiem, Albert Max	Germany	12 Mar. "
Strauss, Max	- ditto	28 "	Thiem, Ernest William	- ditto	12 "
Starridi, John Constantine	Greece	11 Dec. "	Tuczek, Nikolaus	Austria	27 April "
			Tiano, Alfred	Turkey	5 May "
			Tubbe, Albert G. H.	Germany	22 July "

* These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

† This is a special certificate to a person serving under the British Crown in a foreign country (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

§ This is a certificate of re-admission to British nationality under the Act of 1870.

§ This is a special certificate to a person with respect to whose nationality a doubt exists (under the Act of 1870).

N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.	N A M E.	Country and Place of Birth.	Date of Naturalisation.
U. and V.			Ward, Virginia Worthington -		
Van Camp, Jean Francois -	Belgium -	30 April 1872	United States of America -		10 Mar. 1873
Vanger, Joseph -	Russian Poland -	28 May "	Winscheld, Jacob Sallomans -	Poland -	21 April "
Vitale, Nicholas -	Turkey -	29 June "	Weiss, Christian -	Wurtemberg -	22 "
Villinger, Ferdinand -	Baden -	24 July "	Wagner, Jean Francois Eugene -	Alsace -	25 "
Vroom, Anton -	Holland -	17 Aug. "	Wolff, Charles -	Bavaria -	16 June "
Van der Maesen, Laurentius Josephus Wilhelmus Habertus. Vancaille, Jacques Francois (commonly called in England James Vancaille.)	- ditto -	31 " "	† Wolff, Augustus Ludwig -	Prussia -	4 July "
Van Tornow, Charles Ludwig Christoph Constantia.	Belgium -	16 Sept. "	Wagner, Moritz Heinrich Georg Werner, Meyer -	Nassau in Germany -	16 " "
Vander Werff, Hermann Hornfeld	Prussia -	14 Dec. "	Wendt, Adolph Hermann Theodore Waldheim, Felix -	Holland -	26 " "
Valentine, William Brigham -	Hanover -	20 Jan. 1873	Wirth, John Philipp -	Hamburg -	19 Aug. "
Valentine, William Jones -	United States of America -	15 April "	Wilson, John -	ditto -	25 " "
Volz, Charles -	- ditto -	29 May "	Weiss, Gustave -	Germany -	29 " "
Von Gruben, Ernst Carl -	Bavaria -	31 " "	Wendt, Friedrich August -	Norway -	30 Sept. "
Vos, Nathan -	Prussia -	16 June "	Wolff, Jacob Rudolph -	Germany -	20 Nov. "
Vorri, Carlo -	Holland -	30 " "	Wellbrock, Johann Hinrich Wassamuth, Karl Ludwig Gustave	Mecklenburg -	28 " "
Von Glehn, Alexander William -	Italy -	4 July "	Weimer, Samuel -	Prussia -	5 Dec. "
Vogt, William -	Russia -	10 " "	† Warburg, Julius -	Hanover -	9 " "
Vanderstichele, Bruno -	Germany -	8 Aug. "	† Warburg, Albert -	Germany -	23 Jan. 1874
Veglio, John -	Belgium -	10 Sept. "	Wicher, Hermann -	Austria -	20 April "
Von Münster, Edmund John Bernard.	Switzerland -	23 Oct. "	Willing, Solomon Andrew -	Burgurg -	29 May "
Vogt, Henry -	Germany -	27 Nov. "	Wahlhauser, Lewis -	- ditto -	9 June "
Varsami, Constantine Panajote Villeneuve, Theodor Vladimir	Prussia -	2 April 1874	† Windmuller, Albert Charles	Germany -	25 " "
Von Bergen, Axel Hugo Verner	Turkey -	8 " "	Warschawsky, Joseph -	Holland -	10 July "
Von Rudnick, Francis -	Saxony -	21 Aug. "	Winter, Friedrich -	Prussia -	25 Aug. "
Van Raalte, Hermann (otherwise called Henry).	Sweden -	23 Oct. "	† Ward, Alfred -	Germany -	7 Sept. "
Van Raalte, Emanuel -	Germany -	25 Nov. "	Ward, Alice -	Russia -	15 " "
Van Raalte, Abraham -	Holland -	26 " "	Wildermuth, Gustav Alexander -	Germany -	20 Oct. "
Vargues, Paul -	- ditto -	26 " "	Wolf, Bertram -	Chili -	9 Nov. "
Vithoff, Gerardo Manuel -	- ditto -	26 " "	Wernet, August -	- ditto -	9 " "
Vafea, Tharypos -	France -	27 " "	Wagner, Robert -	Germany -	11 Dec. "
Van Oppen, Frits Willem -	Mexico -	29 Jan. 1875	Winkler, Charles -	Baden -	18 " "
Von Linnenfeld, Ludwig Christoph	Greece -	4 Feb. "	Wirth, Valentin -	Prussia -	17 Feb. 1875
Von Schröder, William Henry	Holland -	6 Mar. "	Wohlner, Charles Frederick -	Austria -	22 " "
Von Waterschoot, Charles Gustav	Germany -	13 " "	Waeng, James -	Germany -	22 " "
Vagliano, Alcibiades -	- ditto -	13 " "	Weppeler, Johann Peter Adolph -	Germany -	24 May "
Vimschneider, Charles -	France -	30 April "	Weber, Paul -	- ditto -	31 " "
Vermehin, Hermann Wilhelm	Russia -	4 May "	Wulffleff, Julius Carl Herrmann	Switzerland -	1 June "
Mortz.	Germany -	30 June 1874		Prussia -	30 " "
	- ditto -	5 July 1875		Germany -	16 July "
		8 " "		- ditto -	19 " "
W.			Y.		
Winterhalter, Lukas -	Baden -	31 Mar. 1872	Young, George Henry -	Germany -	10 June 1872
Wagner, Henry -	Germany -	9 April "	Yakinthis, George -	Turkey -	14 Dec. 1874
Weegman, William -	Wurtemberg -	11 " "			
Walther, Edward -	Bavaria -	11 " "	Z.		
Weil, Salomon -	France -	18 May "	Zimbi, Miltiadis Emmanuel -	Greece -	28 May 1872
White, Wolf -	Russian Poland -	27 " "	† Zacharachi, John Zacharia -	- ditto -	28 " "
Weinstein, Aaron -	Poland -	27 " "	Zimmermann, Johann -	Germany -	17 June "
Wollenberg, Moritz -	Prussia -	12 Oct. "	Zimmermann, Agnes -	- ditto -	17 " "
Westhofen, Wilhelm -	Germany -	26 Nov. "	Zeiser, George Ernest -	Bavaria -	27 " "
Wagenheim, Eugene George	Russia -	3 Dec. "	Zimmer, William -	Saxony -	7 Aug. "
Weichert, William -	Austria -	9 " "	Zumbeck, August Christian Henry	Germany -	10 Oct. "
Weichert, Sigmund -	- ditto -	9 " "	Zeigler, Gottlieb Conrad -	- ditto -	5 Feb. 1873
Wolf, Neuman -	Germany -	13 " "	Zumz, Siegfried Rudolf -	- ditto -	12 Mar. "
Wehner, John Gustavus -	Hanover -	23 " "	Zimmermann, Franz Friedrich -	- ditto -	2 Dec. "
Wolfgang, Elias -	Hungary -	31 " "	Zill, Hermann -	- ditto -	12 Mar. "

* This is a special to a person serving under the British Crown in a foreign country (Naturalization Acts, 1870).

† These aliens were already naturalized, but obtained fresh certificates under the Act of 1870.

‡ These are special certificates to persons with respect to whose naturalization a doubt exists under the Act of 1870.

RETURN of the Names and Descriptions of all ALIENS, who, in each year from 1872 to 1875, inclusive, have obtained from the Legislature Acts of NATURALISATION, including the Right of Sitting in Parliament, and being of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

Year.	Name.	Description.	Place of Birth.
1872*	Wallace, Edmond Richard	Esquire -	Paris.
1873	- Nil.	-	-
1874	- Nil.	-	-
1875	- Nil.	-	-

* The Naturalisation (Public) Act received the Royal Assent, 25th July 1872.

William Rose,
Clerk to Parliament.

House of Lords,
6 November 1875.

NATURALISATION CERTIFICATES.

RETURNS of CERTIFICATES of NATURALISATION issued to Aliens by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, under the Provisions of the 7 & 8 Vict. c. 66, and 33 Vict. c. 14, stating the Countries to which such Aliens belonged; And, of the Names and Descriptions of all Aliens who, in each Year since 1871, have obtained from the Legislature Acts of Naturalisation, including the right of Sitting in Parliament and being of Her Majesty's Privy Council (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 142, of Session 1872).

(*Mr. Gorst.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
13 August 1875.*

475

MERTHYR TYDVIL (PRESERVATION OF THE PEACE).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 23 March 1875;—for,

COPY "of the CORRESPONDENCE that has taken place between the Stipendiary Magistrate of *Merthyr*, Mr. *G. T. Clark*, the Chairman of the Board of Guardians of *Merthyr*, and the Home Office, on the subject of calling an additional FORCE of POLICE and a MILITARY FORCE into the MERTHYR DISTRICT."

— No. 1. —

Mr. *Albert de Rutzen* to the Honourable *A. F. O. Liddell*.

(No. 41,103—4.)

Sir,

Merthyr Tydvil, 22 February 1875.

I HAVE the honour to report, for your information, that I have received intelligence from Mr. Superintendent Thomas, who is in command of the county police in this town, that he is of opinion that riots will probably take place, and that, in the present state of his force, it will be impossible for him to preserve the peace.

Colonel Lindsay has been telegraphed for to advise on the present state of affairs, but I am informed that he would not be able, in the present state of the county, to make any material addition to the police force already here, which only numbers 20 men among a population of 45,000.

If he could obtain 100 additional police I think it would be sufficient to preserve the peace, but if it is impossible to obtain that number, I must ask that you would be pleased to order that the military at Brecon and Newport may be held in readiness in case their services should be required.

I may add that they certainly would not be sent for unless their services were actually required, but some such precaution appears positively necessary in case of necessity.

Those persons who are the best able to give an opinion on the subject seem to think that special constables would be of no service in the present state of affairs here.

I may further add, that from* I saw myself this morning, on my way to the police court, I have strong reasons to believe that the fear entertained by Mr. Superintendent Thomas is a well-founded one. * *Sic.*

I have, &c.

The Hon. *A. F. O. Liddell*, *q.c.*

(signed) *A. de Rutzen.*

&c. &c. &c.

Stipendiary Magistrate.

— No. 2. —

The Honourable *A. F. O. Liddell* to Mr. *Albert de Rutzen*.

(No. 41,103—4.)

Sir,

Whitehall, 23 February 1875.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd instant, stating that you have reason to fear that riots will probably take place at Merthyr Tydvil, and requesting that the military stationed at Brecon and Newport may be held in readiness in case their services should

should be required by the civil power; and I am to acquaint you that a copy of your letter will be forwarded to the Secretary of State for War, with a request that instructions may be sent to Brecon and Newport for the troops to be held in readiness in case of their services being required.

Mr. Cross desires me to express a hope that it will not be necessary to call in the aid of the military, and that they will not be used unless absolutely necessary.

I am to add that the Secretary of State has no authority to give directions for additional police being sent to Merthyr Tydfil.

Albert de Rutzen, Esq., J. P.,
Merthyr Tydfil.

I am, &c.
(signed) A. F. O. Liddell.

— No. 3. —

Mr. *Albert de Rutzen* to the Honourable *A. F. O. Liddell*.

(No. 41,103--7.)

Sir,

Merthyr Tydfil, 24 February 1875.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd instant; acquainting me of the fact that the authorities at the War Office have been communicated with; at the same time I beg to assure you that the military will not be sent for, and most certainly not used, unless it becomes absolutely necessary.

I have seen Colonel Lindsay, the Chief Constable, and I am happy to say that he has made arrangements with the boroughs within the county, having police of their own, to have a considerable force sent here if necessary. That being so, I trust we shall be able to preserve the peace of the district without any further assistance, but I considered it my duty at once to communicate with you when representations were made to me on Monday.

I have, &c.
(signed) *A. de Rutzen*,
Stipendiary Magistrate.

The Hon. A. F. O. Liddell, Q. C.
&c. &c. &c.

— No. 4. —

Mr. *G. T. Clark*, J. P., to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

(No. 41,103-5.)

Sir,

Dowlais House, Dowlais,
22 February 1875.

MR. DE RUTZEN, the Stipendiary Magistrate of Merthyr, and Mr. Thomas, the Superintendent of the county police here, have been with me this afternoon to state that some hundreds of men assembled tumultuously in the market square before the police office this morning, demanding to see the magistrate; this, of course, was physically impossible, but the magistrate offered to see a deputation, or to sit as long as it might be necessary; they did not proceed further, but broke up and dispersed.

Mr. Thomas states that their language was threatening, and they talked of helping themselves, that is of breaking into the shops. His opinion is very decidedly that the men were on the verge of riot.

I have telegraphed to the chief constable, a man of courage and resource, and expect him to night; but I do not expect that he can spare a dozen men from the other parts of the country, and we have not above 20 men within the district, so that in the event of an actual riot we should be powerless.

I have thought of special constables, but after due consideration have come to the conclusion that, for local reasons, they would not be a useful body.

If we had say 150 trained constables well officered, I think we could, as
matters

matters now stand, answer for the peace of the district, and I earnestly hope that you may be able so to assist us; but should this be impracticable I see nothing for it but that the soldiers should be held in readiness. There are troops at Newport and Brecon, each within a couple of hours.

The Right Hon.
the Home Secretary,
&c. &c. &c.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Geo. T. Clark,*
A Magistrate for the County
of Glamorgan.

— No. 5. —

The Honourable *A. F. O. Liddell* to Mr. *G. T. Clark*, J. P.

(No. 41,103—4.)

Sir,

Whitehall, 23 February 1875.

I AM directed by the Secretary of State to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd inst., stating that you have reason to fear that riots will probably take place at Merthyr Tydfil, and requesting that the military stationed at Brecon and Newport may be held in readiness in case their services should be required by the civil power; and I am to acquaint you that a copy of your letter will be forwarded to the Secretary of State for War, with a request that instructions may be sent to Brecon and Newport for the troops to be held in readiness in case of their services being required.

Mr. Cross desires me to express a hope that it will not be necessary to call in the aid of the military, and that they will not be used unless absolutely necessary.

I am to add that the Secretary of State has no authority to give directions for additional police being sent to Merthyr Tydvil.

G. T. Clark, Esq., J. P.,
Dowlais House, Dowlais.

I am, &c.
(signed) *A. F. O. Liddell.*

MERTHYR TYDVIL (PRESERVATION
OF THE PEACE).

COPY of the CORRESPONDENCE that has taken place between the Stipendiary Magistrate of *Mertllyn*, Mr. G. T. Clark, the Chairman of the Board of Guardians of *Mertllyn*, and the Home Office, on the subject of calling an additional Force of Police and a MILITARY Force into the MERTHYR DISTRICT.

(*Mr. Macdonald.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
23 March 1875.*

OFFENCES PUNISHABLE BY FLOGGING.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons ;
dated 28 May 1875 ;—for,

“ RETURNS of the Number of PERSONS Convicted of OFFENCES which under the Act 26 & 27 Vict. are PUNISHABLE by FLOGGING, at each ASSIZE TOWN and each Session of the CENTRAL CRIMINAL CRIMINAL COURT since the Year 1862:”

“ And, of the Number of PERSONS Sentenced to be FLOGGED at such Assizes and Sessions respectively since the said Act came into operation.”

MIDDLESEX.

NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.	NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.
Central Criminal Court	1863: 7th Session -	4	-	Central Criminal Court —continued.	1867: 1st Session -	2	-
	8th " -	2	-		2nd " -	6	-
	9th " -	1	-		3rd " -	6	1
	10th " -	2	-		4th " -	7	-
	11th " -	6	1		5th " -	10	-
	12th " -	-	-		6th " -	4	-
	1864: 1st Session -	4	-		7th " -	13	5
	2nd " -	1	-		8th " -	9	2
	3rd " -	-	-		9th " -	1	1
	4th " -	4	1		10th " -	2	-
	5th " -	3	-		11th " -	3	-
	6th " -	6	-		12th " -	6	4
	7th " -	1	-		1868: 1st Session -	2	2
	8th " -	6	-		2nd " -	4	-
	9th " -	3	-		3rd " -	6	-
	10th " -	8	-		4th " -	7	3
	11th " -	4	-		5th " -	3	1
	12th " -	3	-		6th " -	5	1
	1865: 1st Session -	3	-		7th " -	5	-
	2nd " -	1	-		8th " -	3	-
	3rd " -	11	-		9th " -	9	2
	4th " -	8	-		10th " -	5	3
	5th " -	3	-		11th " -	9	7
	6th " -	5	-		12th " -	4	-
	7th " -	8	-		1869: 1st Session -	5	-
	8th " -	15	-		2nd " -	5	1
	9th " -	3	-		3rd " -	2	-
	10th " -	7	-		4th " -	5	-
	11th " -	3	1		5th " -	3	-
	12th " -	9	-		6th " -	6	5
	1866: 1st Session -	1	-		7th " -	10	4
	2nd " -	8	-		8th " -	4	3
	3rd " -	3	-		9th " -	7	1
	4th " -	3	1		10th " -	4	2
	5th " -	4	1		11th " -	11	8
	6th " -	15	1		12th " -	6	3
	7th " -	7	-		1870: 1st Session -	5	1
	8th " -	4	-		2nd " -	4	-
	9th " -	11	3		3rd " -	7	1
	10th " -	3	2		4th " -	14	8
	11th " -	9	5		5th " -	7	2
	12th " -	5	-		6th " -	2	-

MIDDLESEX—continued.

NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.	NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.
Central Criminal Court —continued.	1870—cont ^d .			Central Criminal Court —continued.	1873:		
	7th Session -	2	-		1st Session -	4	3
	8th " -	2	-		2nd " -	6	2
	9th " -	1	-		3rd " -	-	-
	10th " -	5	-		4th " -	1	-
	11th " -	3	1		5th " -	-	-
	12th " -	-	-		6th " -	1	-
					7th " -	-	-
	1871:				8th " -	6	3
	1st Session -	4	-		9th " -	3	-
	2nd " -	3	1		10th " -	2	-
	3rd " -	7	-		11th " -	3	1
	4th " -	7	-		12th " -	-	-
	5th " -	5	1				
	6th " -	5	-		1874:		
	7th " -	3	-		1st Session -	8	2
	8th " -	1	-		2nd " -	2	-
	9th " -	3	-		3rd " -	1	-
	10th " -	4	2		4th " -	1	-
	11th " -	2	2		5th " -	7	1
	12th " -	2	-		6th " -	4	1
					7th " -	3	-
	1872:				8th " -	2	-
	1st Session -	-	-		9th " -	-	-
	2nd " -	1	-		10th " -	4	2
	3rd " -	15	9		11th " -	4	-
	4th " -	2	1		12th " -	-	-
	5th " -	1	-				
	6th " -	-	-		1875:		
	7th " -	1	-		1st Session -	1	1
	8th " -	4	2		2nd " -	-	-
	9th " -	4	2		3rd " -	3	-
	10th " -	2	-		4th " -	3	-
	11th " -	4	-		5th " -	-	-
	12th " -	7	2		6th " -	1	1
					TOTAL - - -	615	127

HOME CIRCUIT.

Chelmsford - - -	14 July 1863	11	-	Maidstone - - -	Dec. - 1868	1	-
Hertford - - -	Dec. - 1863	1	-	Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1869	2	-
Lewes - - -	Dec. - 1863	1	-	Chelmsford - - -	Mar. - 1870	2	-
Kingston - - -	Dec. - 1863	3	1	Maidstone - - -	Mar. - 1870	4	-
Maidstone - - -	Mar. - 1864	4	-	Lewes - - -	Mar. - 1870	1	-
Maidstone - - -	July - 1864	5	-	Chelmsford - - -	July - 1870	1	-
Lewes - - -	Dec. - 1864	1	-	Maidstone - - -	July - 1870	1	-
				Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1871	4	-
Hertford - - -	Mar. - 1865	1	-	Maidstone - - -	July - 1871	3	-
Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1865	4	2	Hertford - - -	Mar. - 1872	1	-
Hertford - - -	July - 1865	1	-	Lewes - - -	Mar. - 1872	3	-
Maidstone - - -	July - 1865	4	-	Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1872	2	2
Croydon - - -	July - 1865	3	-	Chelmsford - - -	July - 1872	1	-
Maidstone - - -	Dec. - 1865	6	-	Maidstone - - -	Mar. - 1873	5	1
Hertford - - -	Mar. - 1866	1	-	Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1873	1	1
Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1866	2	-	Croydon - - -	July - 1873	2	2
Maidstone - - -	July - 1866	6	-	Maidstone - - -	Dec. - 1873	1	-
Maidstone - - -	Dec. - 1866	1	-	Chelmsford - - -	Dec. - 1873	2	-
Chelmsford - - -	Dec. - 1866	5	2	Maidstone - - -	Mar. - 1874	2	-
				Chelmsford - - -	July - 1874	1	-
Maidstone - - -	July - 1867	2	-	Maidstone - - -	July - 1874	2	-
Maidstone - - -	Mar. - 1868	2	-	Kingston - - -	Dec. - 1874	2	2
Kingston - - -	Mar. - 1868	2	2	Hertford - - -	Mar. - 1875	2	-
Chelmsford - - -	July - 1868	1	-				
Maidstone - - -	July - 1868	3	-				
Chelmsford - - -	Dec. - 1868	2	2				
					TOTAL - - -	118	17

NORFOLK CIRCUIT.

NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.	NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.
Bedford - - -	1863 - - -	3 - - -	- - -	Cambridge - - -	1869 - - -	3 - - -	1 - - -
Norwich - - -	1863 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Norwich - - -	1869 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Leicester - - -	1864 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Bury St. Edmunds - - -	1869 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Northampton - - -	1864 - - -	7 - - -	1 - - -	Leicester - - -	1870 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Aylesbury - - -	1864 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Northampton - - -	1870 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Bedford - - -	1864 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Norwich - - -	1870 - - -	6 - - -	- - -
Norwich - - -	1864 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Oakham - - -	1871 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Ipswich - - -	1864 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Leicester - - -	1871 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Northampton - - -	1865 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Northampton - - -	1871 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Cambridge - - -	1865 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Bedford - - -	1871 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Norwich - - -	1865 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Bury St. Edmunds - - -	1871 - - -	2 - - -	1 - - -
Leicester - - -	1866 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Leicester - - -	1872 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Aylesbury - - -	1866 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Ipswich - - -	1872 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Huntingdon - - -	1866 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Leicester - - -	1873 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Norwich - - -	1866 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Northampton - - -	1873 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Ipswich - - -	1866 - - -	4 - - -	- - -	Cambridge - - -	1873 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Aylesbury - - -	1867 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Norwich - - -	1873 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Huntingdon - - -	1867 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Leicester - - -	1874 - - -	5 - - -	- - -
Norwich - - -	1867 - - -	1 - - -	1 - - -	Northampton - - -	1874 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Leicester - - -	1868 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Aylesbury - - -	1874 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Bedford - - -	1868 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Norwich - - -	1874 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Huntingdon - - -	1868 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Ipswich - - -	1874 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Cambridge - - -	1868 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Norwich - - -	1875 - - -	3 - - -	1 - - -
Norwich - - -	1868 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Ipswich - - -	1875 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Bedford - - -	1869 - - -	2 - - -	- - -		TOTAL - - -	102 - - -	5 - - -

MIDLAND CIRCUIT.

Nottingham - - -	1862 - - -	6 - - -	- - -	Warwick - - -	1868 - - -	11 - - -	- - -
Derby - - -	1862 - - -	7 - - -	- - -	Derby - - -	1868 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Warwick - - -	1862 - - -	10 - - -	- - -	Nottingham - - -	1868 - - -	5 - - -	- - -
Northampton - - -	1862 - - -	3 - - -	- - -	Lincolnshire - - -	1868 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Lincolnshire - - -	1862 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Leeds, W. R. - - -	1868 - - -	36 - - -	3 - - -
Northampton - - -	1863 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1868 - - -	2 - - -	1 - - -
Derby - - -	1863 - - -	15 - - -	- - -	Leeds - - -	1868 - - -	10 - - -	- - -
Nottingham - - -	1863 - - -	5 - - -	- - -	Lincoln - - -	1868 - - -	2 - - -	2 - - -
Warwick - - -	1863 - - -	9 - - -	- - -	Warwick - - -	1869 - - -	16 - - -	- - -
Leicester - - -	1863 - - -	3 - - -	- - -	Derby - - -	1869 - - -	6 - - -	- - -
Warwick - - -	1864 - - -	14 - - -	- - -	Nottingham - - -	1869 - - -	4 - - -	- - -
Lincolnshire - - -	1864 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Lincoln - - -	1869 - - -	1 - - -	- - -
Yorkshire - - -	1864 - - -	21 - - -	- - -	Leeds, W. R. - - -	1869 - - -	30 - - -	3 - - -
Derby - - -	1864 - - -	5 - - -	- - -	Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1869 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Nottingham - - -	1864 - - -	3 - - -	- - -	Leeds - - -	1869 - - -	13 - - -	8 - - -
Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1864 - - -	11 - - -	- - -	Warwick - - -	1870 - - -	21 - - -	- - -
Leeds, W. R. - - -	1864 - - -	33 - - -	- - -	Derby - - -	1870 - - -	11 - - -	- - -
Warwick - - -	1865 - - -	18 - - -	- - -	Lincoln - - -	1870 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Derby - - -	1865 - - -	5 - - -	- - -	Leeds, W. R. - - -	1870 - - -	10 - - -	- - -
Nottingham - - -	1865 - - -	11 - - -	- - -	Leeds - - -	1870 - - -	23 - - -	11 - - -
Lincoln - - -	1865 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1870 - - -	2 - - -	2 - - -
Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1865 - - -	3 - - -	- - -	Warwick - - -	1871 - - -	6 - - -	- - -
Leeds, W. R. - - -	1865 - - -	26 - - -	- - -	Derby - - -	1871 - - -	6 - - -	- - -
Derbyshire - - -	1865 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1871 - - -	6 - - -	- - -
Warwick - - -	1866 - - -	11 - - -	- - -	Leeds, W. R. - - -	1871 - - -	43 - - -	1 - - -
Derby - - -	1866 - - -	8 - - -	- - -	Warwick - - -	1872 - - -	14 - - -	- - -
Nottingham - - -	1866 - - -	5 - - -	- - -	Nottingham - - -	1872 - - -	3 - - -	- - -
Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1866 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1872 - - -	4 - - -	- - -
Leeds, W. R. - - -	1866 - - -	29 - - -	2 - - -	Leeds, W. R. - - -	1872 - - -	48 - - -	14 - - -
Warwick - - -	1867 - - -	19 - - -	- - -	Lincoln - - -	1872 - - -	2 - - -	- - -
Derbyshire - - -	1867 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Derby - - -	1872 - - -	8 - - -	- - -
Nottingham - - -	1867 - - -	2 - - -	- - -	Lincoln - - -	1873 - - -	10 - - -	- - -
Leeds, W. R. - - -	1867 - - -	25 - - -	5 - - -	Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1873 - - -	5 - - -	- - -
Derby - - -	1867 - - -	3 - - -	- - -	Leeds - - -	1873 - - -	27 - - -	2 - - -
Lincolnshire - - -	1867 - - -	1 - - -	- - -	Warwick - - -	1873 - - -	20 - - -	2 - - -
Yorkshire, N. and E. - - -	1867 - - -	5 - - -	3 - - -	Derby - - -	1873 - - -	7 - - -	- - -

MIDLAND CIRCUIT—*continued.*

NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.	NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.
Leeds, W. R. - -	1873 - -	9	5	Nottingham - -	1874 - -	1	1
Warwick - - -	1874 - -	16	7	Warwick - - -	1875 - -	7	-
Derby - - - -	1874 - -	6	-	Yorkshire, N. and E.	1875 - -	1	-
Lincoln - - -	1874 - -	2	2	Leeds, W. R. - -	1875 - -	13	-
Yorkshire, N. and E.	1874 - -	4	-	Nottingham - -	1875 - -	3	-
Leeds, W. R. - -	1874 - -	45	5				
					TOTAL - - -	855	79

NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

Yorkshire - -	Winter, 1863	20	-	Northumberland— <i>cont^d</i>	Spring, 1868	1	-
	Spring, 1864	16	9		Summer, 1868	2	-
	TOTAL - - -	36	9		Spring, 1869	2	-
					Summer, 1869	2	-
					Winter, 1869	5	-
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	Summer, 1863	6	-		Summer, 1871	2	-
	Winter, 1863	4	-		Spring, 1872	2	-
	Spring, 1864	1	-		Summer, 1872	3	-
	Summer, 1864	3	-		Spring, 1873	2	-
	Spring, 1865	4	-		Spring, 1874	5	-
	Spring, 1866	6	-		Winter, 1874	4	-
	Spring, 1868	4	-		TOTAL - - -	43	-
	Summer, 1868	2	-				
	Spring, 1869	11	3	Cumberland - -	Summer, 1863	3	-
	Summer, 1869	2	-		Spring, 1864	1	-
	Spring, 1871	3	-		Summer, 1864	1	-
	Winter, 1871	1	1		Spring, 1865	2	-
	Spring, 1872	1	-		Summer, 1868	1	-
	Spring, 1873	4	-		Spring, 1870	1	-
	Summer, 1873	3	-		Spring, 1871	1	-
	Winter, 1873	6	2		Winter, 1871	2	-
	Spring, 1874	8	5		Summer, 1872	3	-
	Summer, 1874	2	2		Spring, 1873	7	-
	Winter 1874	5	1		Spring, 1875	2	-
	Spring, 1875	4	2		TOTAL - - -	24	-
	TOTAL - - -	80	16				
				Westmorland - -	Spring, 1864	2	-
Northumberland -	Summer, 1863	3	-		Spring, 1871	2	-
	Winter, 1863	2	-		Spring, 1872	1	-
	Spring, 1865	1	-		Summer, 1872	3	-
	Summer, 1865	1	-		TOTAL - - -	8	-
	Spring, 1866	4	-				
	Summer, 1866	2	-		GRAND TOTAL - - -	191	25

OXFORD CIRCUIT.

Reading - - -	1863 - -	1	1	Monmouth - - -	1865 - -	1	-
Stafford - - -	1863 - -	1	-	Gloucester - - -	1865 - -	1	-
Shrewsbury - -	1863 - -	2	-	Reading - - - -	1866 - -	1	-
Monmouth - - -	1863 - -	4	-	Worcester - - -	1866 - -	2	-
Reading - - - -	1864 - -	3	-	Stafford - - - -	1866 - -	10	5
Worcester - - -	1864 - -	3	-	Monmouth - - -	1866 - -	3	-
Stafford - - - -	1864 - -	4	-	Reading - - - -	1867 - -	1	-
Shrewsbury - -	1864 - -	1	-	Worcester - - -	1867 - -	3	-
Hereford - - -	1864 - -	1	-	Stafford - - - -	1867 - -	11	1
Gloucester - - -	1864 - -	4	-	Gloucester - - -	1867 - -	1	-
Abingdon - - -	1865 - -	1	-	Worcester - - -	1868 - -	1	-
Worcester - - -	1865 - -	3	-	Stafford - - - -	1868 - -	10	-
Stafford - - - -	1865 - -	14	-	Shrewsbury - - -	1868 - -	6	1

OXFORD CIRCUIT—continued.

NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.	NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.
Gloucester - - -	1868 - - -	1	-	Gloucester - - -	1871 - - -	1	-
Reading - - -	1869 - - -	1	-	Reading - - -	1872 - - -	3	-
Oxford - - -	1869 - - -	1	-	Stafford - - -	1872 - - -	10	1
Worcester - - -	1869 - - -	1	-	Shrewsbury - - -	1872 - - -	1	1
Stafford - - -	1869 - - -	7	-	Gloucester - - -	1872 - - -	2	-
Shrewsbury - - -	1869 - - -	1	-	Reading - - -	1873 - - -	2	-
Hereford - - -	1869 - - -	1	-	Worcester - - -	1873 - - -	5	-
Monmouth - - -	1869 - - -	2	-	Stafford - - -	1873 - - -	4	-
Reading - - -	1870 - - -	1	-	Monmouth - - -	1873 - - -	2	-
Oxford - - -	1870 - - -	3	-	Gloucester - - -	1873 - - -	1	-
Worcester - - -	1870 - - -	7	-	Reading - - -	1874 - - -	3	-
Stafford - - -	1870 - - -	6	-	Worcester - - -	1874 - - -	1	-
Hereford - - -	1870 - - -	3	-	Stafford - - -	1874 - - -	3	1
Reading - - -	1871 - - -	3	-	Shrewsbury - - -	1874 - - -	3	-
Worcester - - -	1871 - - -	3	-	Gloucester - - -	1874 - - -	1	-
Stafford - - -	1871 - - -	10	-	Stafford - - -	1875 - - -	4	-
TOTAL - - -						190	11

WESTERN CIRCUIT.

Winchester	-	-	1863	-	-	2	-	Wells	-	-	1869	-	-	4	-
Exeter	-	-	1863	-	-	1	-	Taunton	-	-	1869	-	-	4	-
Wells	-	-	1863	-	-	7	-	Winchester	-	-	1870	-	-	2	-
Winchester	-	-	1864	-	-	3	-	Exeter	-	-	1870	-	-	2	-
Devizes	-	-	1864	-	-	3	-	Winchester	-	-	1871	-	-	1	-
Taunton	-	-	1864	-	-	1	-	Dorchester	-	-	1871	-	-	1	-
Winchester	-	-	1865	-	-	3	-	Exeter	-	-	1871	-	-	2	-
Winchester	-	-	1866	-	-	4	1	Bodmin	-	-	1871	-	-	2	-
Devizes	-	-	1866	-	-	2	-	Taunton	-	-	1871	-	-	5	-
Dorchester	-	-	1866	-	-	2	-	Devizes	-	-	1872	-	-	1	-
Exeter	-	-	1866	-	-	2	-	Exeter	-	-	1872	-	-	1	-
Bodmin	-	-	1866	-	-	1	-	Exeter, City of	-	-	1872	-	-	2	-
Bristol	-	-	1866	-	-	1	-	Wells	-	-	1872	-	-	1	-
Winchester	-	-	1867	-	-	6	-	Taunton	-	-	1872	-	-	2	-
Devizes	-	-	1867	-	-	3	-	Bristol	-	-	1872	-	-	3	-
Dorchester	-	-	1867	-	-	1	-	Winchester	-	-	1873	-	-	2	-
Exeter	-	-	1867	-	-	1	-	Bodmin	-	-	1873	-	-	2	-
Wells	-	-	1867	-	-	1	-	Wells	-	-	1873	-	-	2	-
Taunton	-	-	1867	-	-	2	-	Taunton	-	-	1873	-	-	1	-
Winchester	-	-	1868	-	-	6	-	Bristol	-	-	1873	-	-	1	-
Bristol	-	-	1868	-	-	1	-	Winchester	-	-	1874	-	-	3	-
Winchester	-	-	1869	-	-	2	-	Devizes	-	-	1874	-	-	2	-
Salisbury	-	-	1869	-	-	1	-	Dorchester	-	-	1874	-	-	1	-
Dorchester	-	-	1869	-	-	2	-	Wells	-	-	1874	-	-	3	-
Exeter	-	-	1869	-	-	4	-	Taunton	-	-	1875	-	-	1	-
Bodmin	-	-	1869	-	-	1	-								

SOUTH WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT.

Haverfordwest - -	1862 - -	2 -	-	Presteign - - -	1869 - -	1 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1863 - -	4 -	-	Brecon - - -	1870 - -	1 -	-
Brecon - - -	1863 - -	2 -	-	Cardiff and Swansea	1871 - -	3 -	-
Haverfordwest - -	1864 - -	5 -	-	Cardiff and Swansea	1872 - -	7 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1864 - -	10 -	-	Brecon - - -	1872 - -	1 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1865 - -	3 -	-	Cardiff and Swansea	1873 - -	1 -	-
Brecon - - -	1865 - -	1 -	-	Carmarthen - - -	1874 - -	2 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1866 - -	3 -	-	Cardiff and Swansea	1874 - -	5 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1867 - -	10 -	-	Brecon - - -	1874 - -	2 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1868 - -	4 -	-	Haverfordwest - -	1875 - -	1 -	-
Cardiff and Swansea	1869 - -	3 -	-	Cardiff and Swansea	1875 - -	10 -	-
Brecon - - -	1869 - -	2 -	-	TOTAL - - -			83 -

NORTH WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT.

NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.	NAME OF ASSIZE.	DATE OF ASSIZE.	Number Convicted for Offences punishable by Flogging.	Number Flogged.
Chester - - -	1863 - - -	8	-	Ruthin - - -	1869 - - -	4	-
Mold - - -	1864 - - -	1	-	Chester - - -	1869 - - -	10	-
Chester - - -	1864 - - -	6	-	Ruthin - - -	1870 - - -	1	-
Newtown - - -	1864 - - -	2	-	Chester - - -	1871 - - -	3	2
Ruthin - - -	1864 - - -	3	-	Ruthin - - -	1872 - - -	1	-
Carnarvon - - -	1865 - - -	1	-	Ruthin - - -	1873 - - -	1	-
Chester - - -	1865 - - -	2	1	Chester - - -	1873 - - -	4	-
Ruthin - - -	1866 - - -	1	-	Chester - - -	1874 - - -	14	1
Chester - - -	1866 - - -	4	3	Beaumaris - - -	1874 - - -	2	-
Chester - - -	1867 - - -	4	-				
Chester - - -	1868 - - -	6	2				
					TOTAL - - -	78	9

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1863	8	-	Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1869	6	1
Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1863	15	3	Lancaster - - -	Spring, 1869	1	-
Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1863	5	-	Manchester - - -	Summer, 1869	7	-
Lancaster - - -	Spring, 1864	2	-	Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1869	6	-
Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1864	1	-	Manchester - - -	Winter, 1869	11	-
Manchester - - -	Summer, 1864	10	2	Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1869	10	-
Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1864	7	3	Lancaster - - -	Spring, 1870	2	-
Manchester - - -	Winter, 1864	6	-	Manchester - - -	Spring, 1870	7	-
Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1864	11	-	Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1870	2	-
Manchester - - -	Spring, 1865	20	1	Lancaster - - -	Summer, 1870	2	-
Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1865	6	-	Manchester - - -	Summer, 1870	1	-
Manchester - - -	Summer, 1865	8	-	Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1870	3	-
Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1865	1	-	Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1870	2	-
Manchester - - -	Winter, 1865	19	-	Manchester - - -	Spring, 1871	2	-
Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1865	5	-	Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1871	2	-
Manchester - - -	Spring, 1866	13	12	Lancaster - - -	Summer, 1871	1	-
Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1866	1	-	Manchester - - -	Summer, 1871	3	-
Manchester - - -	Summer, 1866	13	6	Manchester - - -	Spring, 1872	6	2
Manchester - - -	Winter, 1866	15	-	Manchester - - -	Summer, 1872	3	-
Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1866	5	-	Manchester - - -	Winter, 1872	2	-
Lancaster - - -	Spring, 1867	1	-	Manchester - - -	Spring, 1873	4	-
Manchester - - -	Spring, 1867	10	-	Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1873	2	-
Lancaster - - -	Summer, 1867	4	-	Manchester - - -	Summer, 1873	1	-
Manchester - - -	Summer, 1867	10	-	Manchester - - -	Winter, 1873	1	-
Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1867	5	-	Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1873	4	4
Manchester - - -	Winter, 1867	5	-	Manchester - - -	Spring, 1874	8	3
Manchester - - -	Spring, 1868	7	2	Manchester - - -	Summer, 1874	5	1
Liverpool - - -	Spring, 1868	8	1	Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1874	2	2
Lancaster - - -	Summer, 1868	2	-	Manchester - - -	Winter, 1874	1	-
Manchester - - -	Summer, 1868	8	-	Liverpool - - -	Winter, 1874	8	3
Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1868	3	3	Lancaster - - -	Spring, 1875	2	-
Manchester - - -	Winter, 1868	7	3	Manchester - - -	Spring, 1875	2	-
Liverpool - - -	Summer, 1868	1	-				
Manchester - - -	Spring, 1869	3	1				
					TOTAL - - -	364	53

COUNTY PALATINE OF DURHAM.

Durham - - -	1863 - - -	8	-	Durham—continued -	1871 - - -	5	-
	1864 - - -	9	2		1872 - - -	9	-
	1865 - - -	4	-		1873 - - -	4	-
	1866 - - -	4	-		1874 - - -	18	8
	1867 - - -	4	-		1875 - - -	1	-
	1868 - - -	19	-				
	1869 - - -	2	-				
	1870 - - -	9	2				
					TOTAL - - -	96	12

S U M M A R Y.

NAME OF CIRCUIT.	NUMBER CONVICTED.	NUMBER FLOGGED.
CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT, MIDDLESEX - - -	615	127
HOME CIRCUIT - - - - -	118	17
NOEFOLK CIRCUIT - - - - -	102	5
MIDLAND CIRCUIT - - - - -	855	79
NORTHERN CIRCUIT - - - - -	191	25
OXFORD CIRCUIT - - - - -	190	11
WESTERN CIRCUIT - - - - -	114	1
SOUTH WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT - - -	83	—
NORTH WALES AND CHESTER CIRCUIT - - -	78	9
COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER - - - -	364	53
COUNTY PALATINE OF DURHAM - - - - -	96	12
GRAND TOTAL - - -	2,806	339

OFFENCES PUNISHABLE BY FLOGGING.

RETURNS of the Number of Persons Convicted of Offences which under the Act 26 & 27 Vict. are PUNISHABLE by FLOGGING, at each Assize Town and each Session of the CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT since the Year 1862 ; and, of the Number of Persons Sentenced to be Flogged at such Assizes and Sessions respectively since the said Act came into operation.

(*Mr. Herschell.*)

*Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be Printed,
6 August 1875.*

PRIVY COUNCIL (OATH TAKEN BY THE CLERK).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 22 February 1875 ;—for,

“ COPY of the OATH taken by the CLERK of HER MAJESTY’S PRIVY COUNCIL
on Appóintment.”

THE OATH OF A CLERK OF THE COUNCIL.

You shall swear to be a true and faithful Servant unto the Queen’s Majesty, in the exercise of the functions of the Clerk of the Privy Council in ordinary. You shall not know or understand of any manner of thing to be attempted, done, or spoken against Her Majesty’s Person, Honor, Crown or Dignity Royal : but you shall lett, and withstand the same to the uttermost of your Power, and either do or cause it to be revealed, either to Her Majesty Herself, or to the Privy Council. You shall keep secret all Matters committed and revealed unto you, or that shall be treated of secretly in Council. And if any of the said Treaties or Councils shall touch any of the Counsellors, you shall not reveal it unto him, but shall keep the same until such time as, by the Consent of Her Majesty, or by the Council, Publication shall be made thereof. You shall to your uttermost bear faith and allegiance to the Queen’s Majesty ; and shall assist and defend all Jurisdictions, Pre-eminences, and Authorities, granted to Her Majesty, and annexed to the Crown by Act of Parliament, or otherwise, against all Foreign Princes, Persons, Prelates, States or Potentates. And generally in all things You shall do as a faithful and true Servant and Subject ought to do to Her Majesty.

So help You God, and by the Holy Contents of this Book.

PRIVY COUNCIL (OATH TAKEN BY
THE CLERK).

COPY of the OATH taken by the CLERK of HER
MAJESTY'S PRIVY COUNCIL on Appointment.

(*Sir William Fraser.*)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
3 March 1875.*

PROSECUTIONS.

RETURN to Two Addresses of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 22 and 29 April 1875;—for,

(ADDRESS, 22 April 1875.)

“ RETURN of the COSTS of PROSECUTIONS in *England* and *Wales* during the Six
Half Years ending on the 30th day of June 1874 :—

- (1.) At ASSIZES;
- (2.) At QUARTER SESSIONS;
- (3.) In Summary Proceedings under the CRIMINAL JUSTICE and JUVENILE
OFFENDERS ACTS;

Showing for each COUNTY and for each BOROUGH having a separate Court of
Quarter Sessions :—

- (a.) The Total Number of Prosecutions of each Class in each Half Year;
- (b.) The Amounts claimed from the Treasury in respect of the Prosecutions of
each Class in each Half Year;
- (c.) The Total Amount repaid by the Treasury in respect of such Prosecutions.”

(*Mr. Gorst.*)

(ADDRESS, 29 April 1875.)

“ THAT there be added to the RETURN relative to PROSECUTIONS [Ordered 22nd April],
on the Motion of *Mr. Gorst*,—

(d.) A STATEMENT of DISALLOWANCES made under the following Heads
for the Years 1872 and 1873, viz. :—

Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales of Regulations of Secretary of State.	Court Fees Obsolete, and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.

(*Mr. William Henry Smith.*)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
1 June 1875.

RETURN of the Costs of PROSECUTIONS in *England and Wales*, during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874.

COUNTIES.

COUNTY.	Half Years ending	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.	
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.		
ENGLAND:			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	BEDFORD - - -	31 Dec. 1871	7	78 3 8	75 3 -	22	135 2 3	127 15 9	34	42 10 6	41 5 -	15	12 7 -	10 12 9	*Whenever the allowance exceeds the claim (as in this instance), the difference arises from the restoration of items which were disallowed, or queried, in previous returns.
	- - -	30 June 1872	13	218 4 8	186 14 9	9	65 14 4	56 17 8	32	33 12 9	32 17 9	5	2 5 3	2 1 6	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	4	26 10 4	* 29 12 10	13	114 12 10	98 3 8	11	14 16 4	12 17 9	4	2 16 -	1 14 -	
	- - -	30 June 1873	10	108 12 -	104 6 -	7	71 4 1	70 4 7	21	27 4 11	26 - 5	4	2 14 6	2 14 6	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	5	38 17 6	37 2 4	14	102 5 3	93 15 2	35	43 5 1	41 16 3	9	5 7 6	5 2 -	
- - -	30 June 1874	5	38 13 11	38 5 5	13	126 15 9	118 16 3	20	24 18 1	23 12 7	1	- 13 -	- 13 -		
BERKS			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	- - -	31 Dec. 1871	11	116 9 1	114 5 5	27	211 18 6	200 19 -	61	73 11 5	71 4 10	1	- 15 -	- 13 -	
	- - -	30 June 1872	18	142 19 3	130 - 10	25	200 - 3	192 17 5	56	68 7 9	63 19 7	7	5 6 6	4 14 6	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	5	36 - 7	35 15 1	25	195 13 3	189 1 9	84	106 4 3	67 5 5	6	2 1 6	2 1 6	
	- - -	30 June 1873	16	145 8 8	143 18 10	25	179 11 6	168 16 6	89	108 5 9	105 4 4	12	9 12 9	9 8 3	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	8	76 3 10	75 5 10	16	140 8 8	136 9 8	52	70 - 7	68 5 3	8	5 2 9	4 13 9	
BUCKINGHAM			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	- - -	31 Dec. 1871	20	286 4 10	277 5 7	35	380 9 5	355 18 5	97	119 3 4	117 11 -	12	7 10 -	7 10 -	
	- - -	30 June 1872	24	260 11 7	234 4 4	31	274 13 -	249 12 1	73	92 16 5	91 12 7	7	4 11 8	4 11 8	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	10	140 11 9	131 3 3	40	353 13 8	339 17 8	52	63 17 1	63 6 10	18	14 - 11	14 - 11	
	- - -	30 June 1873	32	369 - 1	350 18 9	25	242 7 10	229 12 -	61	71 10 8	70 3 8	15	11 12 -	11 3 -	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	24	415 1 7	380 5 3	26	252 8 -	243 4 4	64	80 15 5	80 - 5	8	6 3 -	6 2 -	
CAMBRIDGE			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	- - -	30 June 1874	12	159 8 -	156 19 3	33	387 8 5	362 9 3	54	65 10 1	64 11 11	6	4 14 8	4 8 2	
	- - -	31 Dec. 1871	5	41 10 -	38 10 -	11	102 - 10	94 16 11	27	44 15 6	40 9 10	1	1 - -	- 17 -	
	- - -	30 June 1872	3	54 12 6	50 7 4	4	50 1 10	38 14 10	26	38 13 -	36 7 4	1	- - -	- - -	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	6	66 10 8	63 6 5	18	179 10 2	170 4 3	17	26 12 4	25 12 10	1	1 14 -	1 14 -	
	- - -	30 June 1873	3	33 13 8	33 14 -	10	95 6 1	93 5 5	26	36 5 6	34 - 6	7	8 10 10	7 18 2	
CHESTER			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	- - -	31 Dec. "	7	87 7 4	86 - 4	15	138 11 3	153 12 2	17	25 4 -	24 12 6	3	2 10 2	2 10 2	
	- - -	30 June 1874	4	76 15 -	75 14 -	11	111 - 10	109 12 6	31	43 3 -	37 3 -	3	3 2 10	3 - 4	
	- - -	31 Dec. 1871	29	433 10 2	400 3 4	198	1,779 9 1	1,730 12 1	172	192 - -	187 1 3	45	30 15 9	30 1 11	
	- - -	30 June 1872	21	355 6 8	334 - 10	201	1,907 19 -	1,809 10 3	153	163 7 6	161 2 4	38	26 18 2	25 18 10	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	16	312 8 5	300 12 -	189	1,843 19 10	1,787 5 4	131	146 11 8	144 12 3	41	26 8 5	25 3 11	
CORNWALL			£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	- - -	30 June 1873	35	1,026 10 10	1,001 12 11	177	1,685 9 1	1,630 11 -	150	171 4 2	167 15 -	43	27 14 10	26 17 -	
	- - -	31 Dec. "	33	408 5 1	382 14 8	184	1,760 11 3	1,709 12 6	195	229 1 6	221 11 2	47	34 2 7	32 1 1	
	- - -	30 June 1874	23	570 5 8	553 16 8	188	1,795 7 2	1,733 11 6	227	259 18 8	249 - 4	69	43 15 2	42 17 8	
	- - -	31 Dec. 1871	18	220 6 7	217 11 7	55	493 12 11	483 2 6	34	37 16 9	37 16 9	4	2 3 -	2 3 -	
	- - -	30 June 1872	34	400 16 11	379 11 3	24	173 - 1	170 3 1	26	30 - -	30 - -	9	6 8 -	6 8 -	

[illegible]

Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in *England and Wales*, during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874—*continued*.

COUNTY.	Half Years ending.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	
RUTLAND	31 Dec. 1871	-	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
	30 June 1872	3	19 17 6	19 12 -	10 7 2	7 17 8	8 11 -	5	8 11 -	7 7 8	1	11 -	11 -	
	31 Dec. "	1	7 14 2	7 11 2	15 2 8	12 13 -	4 13 9	3	4 13 9	4 2 1	1	-	-	
	30 June 1873	4	35 11 11	35 10 5	38 5 6	34 14 2	17 7 1	12	17 7 1	15 17 7	2	2 9 2	2 9 2	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SALOP	30 June 1874	2	12 14 -	12 14 -	2 2 6	1 7 10	4 6 2	7	4 6 2	4 14 6	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	18	165 - 1	164 17 1	252 15 8	266 10 8	33 5 1	32	33 5 1	31 7 1	9	6 - 5	6 - 5	
	30 June 1872	7	60 9 4	59 13 2	320 8 8	319 11 4	44 3 3	39	44 3 3	44 8 9	8	4 13 3	4 13 3	
	31 Dec. "	11	75 10 10	75 17 6	249 8 1	250 2 5	30 17 7	27	30 17 7	30 17 7	3	1 10 6	1 10 6	
	30 June 1873	13	152 7 3	151 17 3	397 11 5	389 4 11	27 30 12 10	27	30 12 10	30 12 10	11	6 18 11	6 18 11	
SOMERSET	31 Dec. "	12	141 13 6	140 13 6	317 3 9	317 3 9	31 34 14 4	31	34 14 4	34 14 4	3	2 4 10	2 4 10	
	30 June 1874	5	54 7 -	54 6 -	342 9 2	341 4 2	21 23 11 2	21	23 11 2	23 11 2	5	2 10 -	2 -	
	31 Dec. 1871	33	421 4 11	398 11 7	604 5 3	589 7 6	149 5 4	148	149 5 4	146 8 10	34	21 16 10	19 10 10	
	30 June 1872	60	761 5 3	729 7 2	538 9 8	511 3 8	174 18 7	156	174 18 7	166 13 7	42	26 9 11	24 1 11	
	31 Dec. "	16	187 17 8	182 19 6	506 13 9	495 3 -	149 4 2	127	149 4 2	141 8 2	26	19 13 8	18 10 2	
STAFFORD	30 June 1873	60	845 14 10	800 1 5	37 38 3	320 1 -	161 2 3	140	150 1 9	161 2 3	43	31 11 3	31 11 9	
	31 Dec. "	48	949 5 7	933 10 4	524 5 11	506 12 -	100 4 11	95	100 4 11	102 14 10	22	13 18 -	12 1 6	
	30 June 1874	39	486 16 -	470 3 3	354 10 3	342 13 10	98 4 -	85	98 4 -	97 4 8	30	19 15 8	18 19 8	
	31 Dec. 1871	45	721 16 9	698 15 9	1,008 19 6	973 6 1	211 14 4	197	211 14 4	211 14 4	56	32 14 2	31 14 2	
	30 June 1872	25	408 10 1	406 8 -	956 14 1	937 1 1	158 9 3	144	158 9 3	157 11 3	43	24 15 6	24 15 6	
SUFFOLK (EAST)	31 Dec. 1872	54	819 12 1	818 - 7	882 3 10	830 11 6	162 - 2	161	162 - 2	162 19 3	46	30 7 -	27 6 10	
	30 June 1873	22	276 10 1	270 17 9	1,251 15 2	1,212 10 1	206 19 1	197	206 19 1	203 19 3	46	27 6 10	27 6 10	
	31 Dec. "	29	436 13 7	435 9 7	1,114 17 3	1,114 4 8	282 15 3	249	282 15 3	282 15 3	61	35 11 8	35 11 8	
	30 June 1874	33	615 5 11	614 9 8	1,110 1 6	1,084 19 9	178 16 1	155	178 16 1	178 16 1	41	22 7 6	22 7 6	
	31 Dec. 1871	8	132 16 5	125 17 11	149 14 6	133 19 4	70 10 7	47	70 10 7	66 4 3	17	15 7 10	13 6 4	
SUFFOLK (WEST)	30 June 1872	10	128 17 2	124 14 2	106 6 1	99 5 2	62 19 10	46	62 19 10	61 10 7	7	6 11 6	6 11 6	
	31 Dec. "	10	138 4 9	135 2 3	136 16 -	120 4 4	76 12 4	51	76 12 4	64 1 7	10	8 5 4	7 10 10	
	30 June 1873	10	162 1 10	150 9 4	183 - 1	162 15 6	67 16 5	48	67 16 5	63 9 10	15	14 11 7	10 4 2	
	31 Dec. "	2	27 12 6	27 3 6	103 10 4	93 4 -	54 11 3	35	54 11 3	50 16 3	11	12 2 9	7 16 9	
	30 June 1874	7	122 6 8	110 15 2	143 - 8	129 16 3	66 3 6	46	66 3 6	64 11 10	10	10 9 5	7 19 5	
SURREY	31 Dec. 1871	4	43 19 2	42 - 7	160 12 5	142 17 1	44 1 8	34	44 1 8	38 6 4	4	3 8 8	3 2 -	
	30 June 1872	5	81 17 2	80 10 8	97 7 5	92 3 11	45 16 -	32	45 16 -	40 6 6	7	5 6 6	4 14 -	
	31 Dec. "	2	18 3 10	17 16 10	146 1 10	135 15 3	26 1 4	18	26 1 4	24 6 2	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	6	88 12 3	85 6 1	96 7 8	74 17 4	31 17 4	23	31 17 4	23 18 2	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	52 2 10	48 8 1	39 5 4	27	39 5 4	36 12 -	5	4 12 4	4 3 -	
SURREY	30 June 1874	11	362 15 2	351 8 9	117 7 10	122 10 4	45 5 -	29	44 18 10	45 5 -	4	4 3 7	4 3 7	
	31 Dec. 1871	7	43 6 8	40 18 8	1,676 6 10	1,527 1 4	172 14 8	312	172 14 8	165 14 1	8	6 11 -	6 9 -	
	30 June 1872	13	187 2 6	179 16 6	1,267 6 2	1,193 7 11	131 16 10	281	133 16 10	131 19 4	8	6 10 10	6 9 4	
	31 Dec. "	18	227 2 11	202 8 5	1,346 13 2	1,306 12 11	162 10 6	313	162 10 6	162 10 6	10	8 16 2	8 16 2	
	30 June 1873	21	246 4 -	182 19 -	1,270 18 3	1,275 10 11	172 10 7	408	172 10 7	171 1 1	10	9 4 5	8 16 5	
SURREY	31 Dec. "	14	176 16 7	173 16 5	1,274 18 3	1,268 13 7	131 15 4	297	134 15 4	133 11 4	8	5 8 8	5 8 8	
	30 June 1874	24	170 2 10	159 4 10	1,431 8 4	1,413 10 6	196 2 8	334	195 2 8	194 3 2	17	10 11 4	10 11 4	

SURREY:

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.

No.

Claimed.

Allowed.

£. s. d.

£. s. d.

£. s. d.

£. s. d.

£. s. d.

SUSSEX (East)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in *England and Wales*, during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874—*continued*.

COUNTY.	Half Year ending	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	
YORK (WEST RIDING)	31 Dec. 1871	90	1,538 14 -	1,459 19 2	373	3,096 11 5	2,880 9 9	357	449 15 7	439 5 1	45	34 12 4	34 7 4	
	30 June 1872	57	1,702 12 4	1,525 18 3	290	1,945 12 6	1,904 1 8	318	393 18 4	391 18 10	72	49 7 3	44 10 7	
	31 Dec. "	90	1,725 11 -	1,677 14 5	342	2,490 10 3	2,433 2 1	351	420 4 11	413 9 11	42	28 13 3	27 12 -	
	30 June 1873	37	729 17 -	701 17 2	358	2,484 10 7	2,426 18 1	356	439 8 7	438 2 5	59	43 3 -	43 - 4	
	31 Dec. "	66	1,312 18 3	1,277 6 8	303	2,048 7 7	2,007 15 6	392	502 13 11	496 15 5	56	41 17 5	39 18 11	
	30 June 1874	58	1,123 8 1	1,053 9 5	352	2,466 18 5	2,416 - 4	348	399 6 7	397 11 5	56	38 1 6	33 6 -	
WALES:														
	31 Dec. 1871	2	13 17 6	12 13 2	15	214 17 6	157 9 -	7	12 2 6	10 3 3	2	1 9 10	1 7 10	
	30 June 1872	3	25 13 11	19 19 9	4	35 6 4	26 16 4	7	4 7 2	2 19 4	3	4 - -	2 7 4	
	31 Dec. "	5	63 10 10	56 14 2	-	50 2 6	39 9 1	1	2 18 6	6 1 10	1	1 14 -	1 14 -	
	30 June 1873	2	24 - 10	22 3 2	3	36 13 -	30 17 4	4	7 18 2	7 18 2	3	2 18 8	1 8 4	
	31 Dec. "	12	-	-	1	14 17 8	10 16 6	1	1 11 -	1 7 4	2	2 5 6	- 19 -	
BRECON	31 Dec. 1871	5	56 17 11	47 12 -	7	72 8 8	65 8 10	10	11 11 2	11 1 2	1	- 14 -	- 14 -	
	30 June 1872	6	68 9 5	78 18 3	8	80 5 -	78 8 2	7	9 5 -	9 3 5	-	- - -	- - -	
	31 Dec. "	10	137 19 6	122 18 2	8	83 18 11	82 10 7	4	4 17 -	4 17 -	-	- - -	- - -	
	30 June 1873	15	181 7 5	162 5 3	10	73 1 6	70 6 11	13	15 7 5	13 17 5	-	- - -	- - -	
	31 Dec. "	4	61 17 2	57 15 2	10	93 13 2	87 4 10	10	12 11 8	11 2 10	2	1 3 -	1 3 -	
	30 June 1874	10	222 18 2	209 12 2	3	52 19 9	52 2 9	16	18 9 7	18 4 7	1	1 10 -	1 10 -	
CARDIGAN	31 Dec. 1871	2	18 10 2	14 3 7	4	38 5 8	24 11 10	9	10 19 6	10 10 6	-	- - -	- - -	
	30 June 1872	2	27 5 3	24 12 9	1	18 3 2	12 8 10	11	11 7 6	11 6 -	-	- - -	- - -	
	31 Dec. "	2	42 13 -	39 19 10	4	38 3 5	25 18 -	4	4 19 -	4 1 6	-	- - -	- - -	
	30 June 1873	2	17 16 5	15 8 7	2	27 11 10	13 14 3	1	1 10 8	1 9 8	2	1 3 -	13 - 6	
	31 Dec. "	3	79 19 6	71 9 2	6	68 17 4	45 2 9	3	3 10 -	3 10 -	1	- 18 6 -	- 11 6 -	
	30 June 1874	3	47 18 7	43 3 3	1	8 13 -	6 1 6	7	8 3 6	7 10 -	1	- 14 -	- 14 -	
CARMARTHEN	31 Dec. 1871	4	59 17 1	51 8 11	10	81 - 9	75 5 2	19	25 18 2	21 2 3	2	1 9 -	1 - -	
	30 June 1872	12	196 7 7	155 - 7	8	79 17 8	69 18 1	11	17 6 -	14 9 10	-	- - -	- - -	
	31 Dec. "	3	92 5 2	88 8 2	6	49 4 1	45 17 3	10	14 18 4	11 15 4	-	- - -	- - -	
	30 June 1873	4	42 1 5	37 13 8	-	41 10 2	31 2 8	14	19 12 2	13 14 10	2	1 14 -	- 19 -	
	31 Dec. "	1	-	-	11	106 17 2	101 11 11	16	19 16 10	17 8 4	2	1 14 6	1 14 6	
	30 June 1874	4	85 9 9	80 15 3	2	18 1 4	17 7 4	5	6 4 10	5 - 4	2	1 16 -	1 11 6	
CARNARVON	31 Dec. 1871	2	24 10 4	21 18 6	16	124 4 9	103 7 -	6	8 1 7	7 2 7	-	- - -	- - -	
	30 June 1872	7	91 7 -	83 6 4	9	73 19 7	66 14 1	12	15 8 9	13 13 -	-	- - -	- - -	
	31 Dec. "	3	41 1 -	38 4 7	9	61 3 3	52 19 3	3	16 14 9	13 13 3	1	- 15 4 -	- 10 -	
	30 June 1873	13	127 7 4	114 5 6	4	46 6 10	31 3 4	13	16 14 9	13 13 3	3	2 4 6	1 10 -	
	31 Dec. "	1	9 11 4	8 12 6	6	38 19 4	32 15 10	7	9 7 8	9 16 -	3	- - -	- - -	
	30 June 1874	7	71 12 6	64 2 6	6	59 3 11	33 15 5	1	1 - -	- 16 -	4	- - -	- - -	

DENBIGH	31 Dec. 1871	5	111 10 10	103 - 2	12	140 8 9	111 1 3	16	18 13 -	16 15 9	-	1 19 1	-18 -
	30 June 1872	9	103 18 8	94 2 10	3	33 9 9	29 11 11	27	24 7 4	2	2	1 13 6	1 -
	31 Dec. "	4	68 13 8	52 13 8	4	52 4 3	45 19 11	22	19 16 6	2	2	1 13 -	1 2 -
	30 June 1873	6	108 6 6	89 10 1	8	97 12 7	81 15 9	13	12 4 10	-	-	1 13 -	-
	31 Dec. "	4	83 11 2	91 13 4	19	227 1 5	188 19 5	19	16 13 8	-	-	5 5 6	4 17 6
	30 June* 1874	10	143 10 6	128 11 -	7	86 9 7	77 10 1	16	17 13 9	8	8	-	-
FLINT	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	10	93 3 1	78 14 2	13	17 12 6	15 16 -	-	5 - 2	3 16 -
	30 June 1872	6	65 13 4	59 7 6	7	64 14 11	55 7 9	20	26 15 -	6	6	-15 6	-15 6
	31 Dec. "	2	19 7 6	16 10 -	10	75 12 2	61 6 10	14	20 3 1	1	1	-10 -	-10 -
	30 June 1873	6	60 2 11	50 13 4	3	19 3 8	19 3 8	10	14 -	1	1	-15 6	-15 6
	31 Dec. "	1	8 15 2	8 - 4	5	81 16 2	57 4 2	20	27 16 10	1	1	-15 6	-15 6
	30 June 1874	7	320 6 11	286 8 7	3	37 17 10	32 13 -	9	12 18 9	-	-	-	-
GLAMORGAN	31 Dec. 1871	43	844 15 6	710 15 1	118	1,119 13 8	1,005 8 7	160	174 14 8	34	34	21 13 -	19 9 6
	30 June 1872	26	551 5 3	426 7 10	98	970 - 7	878 9 1	127	140 16 10	37	37	24 5 6	22 7 6
	31 Dec. "	37	591 18 7	515 18 5	113	886 17 8	866 8 1	128	147 1 2	38	38	28 13 -	23 -
	30 June 1873	42	649 3 2	677 3 6	148	1,110 19 11	1,094 16 9	142	171 9 3	41	41	27 8 8	20 15 -
	31 Dec. "	19	300 16 2	375 10 3	152	1,574 18 8	1,540 13 -	146	167 8 11	35	35	21 2 6	20 12 6
	30 June 1874	39	733 11 8	790 7 11	125	1,003 8 3	987 2 4	149	157 14 11	32	32	18 8 2	21 3 8
MERIONETH	31 Dec. 1871	1	14 - 1	12 14 9	7	68 19 8	54 12 8	10	11 1 9	2	2	1 8 6	1 8 6
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	6	53 3 6	42 3 11	3	5 3 7	-	-	-17 -	-14 -
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	6	55 17 6	43 5 10	6	7 4 6	1	1	-	-
	30 June 1873	4	35 19 8	25 18 5	-	-	-	1	1 5 6	-	-	-	-
	31 Dec. "	7	-	-	7	71 12 2	53 16 8	1	1 -	-	-	-	-
	30 June 1874	2	27 - 1	23 10 2	4	40 11 8	30 17 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
MONTGOMERY	31 Dec. 1871	7	79 19 6	70 18 6	22	163 19 -	158 2 7	13	15 13 3	-	-	2 6 6	1 19 6
	30 June 1872	6	75 5 5	66 - 4	23	225 15 8	194 14 2	9	11 5 9	2	2	-	-
	31 Dec. "	2	27 16 6	23 18 8	16	159 4 2	143 2 4	7	8 7 2	-	-	2 10 4	2 10 4
	30 June 1873	5	46 17 4	41 16 -	13	137 3 1	119 11 3	10	9 16 -	2	2	-13 -	-10 -
	31 Dec. "	1	11 - 2	10 5 4	16	134 19 3	133 9 7	12	19 18 11	1	1	1 12 -	1 7 -
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	9	78 7 5	72 4 5	9	10 19 8	2	2	-	-
PEMBROKE	31 Dec. 1871	4	39 8 8	31 17 7	10	81 15 8	57 4 11	4	4 19 11	1	1	-13 -	-11 6
	30 June 1872	4	52 15 1	47 4 2	6	61 15 10	46 16 10	10	16 3 11	1	1	-18 6	-13 6
	31 Dec. "	5	63 19 -	56 3 10	5	46 8 6	33 4 4	11	17 2 7	2	2	1 16 9	1 7 6
	30 June 1873	11	215 13 4	191 18 4	3	27 7 11	23 7 3	1	1 1 6	-	-	1 7 1	1 5 10
	31 Dec. "	1	7 7 6	6 7 6	1	11 19 3	9 13 4	14	18 10 10	2	2	-17 6	-15 -
	30 June 1874	4	69 17 8	64 9 10	4	34 9 -	27 13 3	5	7 7 2	1	1	-	-
RADNOR	31 Dec. 1871	4	53 14 8	44 15 6	3	31 6 8	28 8 4	4	5 16 -	-	-	-	-
	30 June 1872	4	37 17 3	33 4 5	1	11 17 8	10 - 11	2	2 1 -	-	-	-	-
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	1	9 10 10	6 13 2	1	1 -	-	-	-	-
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Returns not yet received.

[illegible]

Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in *England and Wales*, during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1864.—*continued.*

BOROUGH.	Half Years ending	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.	
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.		
BUCKINGHAM	31 Dec. 1871	1	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	30 June 1872	1	19 - 4	-	18 15 6	-	-	1	1 12 -	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	18 19 4	-	-	1	1 1 -	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	5 2 -	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	1	14 4 2	12 9 2	-	16 14 -	-	4	4 1 -	-	3 17 -	-	-	-	
BURY ST. EDMUNDS	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	64 16 10	-	61 18 4	-	5 9 -	-	5 9 -	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	1	17 12 6	17 12 6	16 1 -	-	12 2 6	-	4 4 7 -	-	4 4 7 -	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	31 19 6	-	29 6 -	-	5 17 -	-	5 16 -	-	1 3 -	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	13 2 -	-	15 3 6	-	5 9 -	-	5 9 -	-	1 18 -	-	
	30 June 1874	1	5 10 6	5 9 6	-	20 4 6	-	18 13 6	-	3 4 7 -	-	3 4 7 -	-	1 6 -	
CAMBRIDGE	31 Dec. 1871	4	76 14 4	46 19 6	83 18 2	-	72 13 2	-	29 14 6	-	18 9 6	-	3 15 -	-	
	30 June 1872	4	65 10 3	56 15 5	130 6 3	-	90 14 7	-	29 6 -	-	18 15 -	-	2 5 -	-	
	31 Dec. "	1	6 7 -	5 13 6	68 17 2	-	58 13 10	-	21 28 9 -	-	19 7 -	-	4 17 6	-	
	30 June 1873	3	50 13 -	46 6 6	77 5 1	-	66 5 7	-	6 7 6	-	4 14 -	-	2 19 -	-	
	30 June 1874	1	22 11 10	19 1 6	129 15 3	-	106 - 2	-	18 23 6 6	-	16 18 -	-	2 2 6	-	
CANTERBURY	31 Dec. 1871	1	5 6 4	4 2 -	36 2 -	-	21 5 -	-	12 11 16 -	-	11 16 -	-	10 -	-	
	30 June 1872	1	5 7 8	5 4 8	39 4 6	-	28 13 6	-	8 12 6	-	10 14 6	-	1 16 -	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	63 - 4	-	50 15 10	-	10 10 15 6	-	10 11 6	-	1 3 -	-	
	30 June 1873	2	15 5 -	14 17 -	37 16 6	-	29 17 6	-	8 8 6 -	-	8 4 -	-	2 5 -	-	
	30 June 1874	1	8 11 6	8 4 6	76 16 10	-	19 19 6	-	20 21 -	-	21 -	-	1 13 -	-	
CARLISLE	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
CARMARTHEN	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	2	18 -	13 14 10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
CHESTER	31 Dec. 1871	4	28 13 5	28 - 5	76 - 2	-	64 1 2	-	11 20 9 10	-	10 8 -	-	2 -	-	
	30 June 1872	3	34 1 1	32 15 5	121 6 11	-	88 - 5	-	21 19 2 -	-	19 2 -	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	3	51 8 4	49 10 4	87 - 1	-	72 6 1	-	14 14 6 4	-	12 14 -	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	2	30 2 4	25 7 4	91 12 2	-	52 5 6	-	22 21 16 6	-	20 7 -	-	10 -	-	
	30 June 1874	3	36 19 4	35 1 5	75 7 4	-	78 - 8	-	15 24 16 4	-	15 1 6	-	-	-	

Not incorporated.

No return received.

[illegible]

Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in *England and Wales*, during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874—*continued*.

BOROUGH.	Half Years ending	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	
ELY, ISLE OF (LIBERTY)	31 Dec. 1871	16	£. s. d. 238 7 9	£. s. d. 218 16 1	17	£. s. d. 187 7 3	£. s. d. 141 9 2	18	£. s. d. 25 10 10	£. s. d. 23 13 1	3	£. s. d. 2 14 2	£. s. d. 2 10 2	
	30 June 1872	8	114 13 8	107 16 6	10	115 8 10	85 - 7	26	35 3 5	33 10 11	2	1 6 -	1 4 -	
	31 Dec. 1873	4	55 19 2	52 5 8	23	341 12 3	193 9 2	23	31 13 1	30 12 1	3	2 14 6	2 5 9	
	31 Dec. 1874	-	-	-	24	333 13 2	232 - 4	11	14 8 4	13 18 8	5	4 10 6	3 15 6	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	13	181 17 2	131 8 -	16	19 19 2	17 19 3	-	-	-	-
EXETER	31 Dec. 1871	4	23 14 9	20 11 6	9	65 16 11	62 11 5	16	19 18 11	18 19 8	5	3 8 -	2 17 -	
	30 June 1872	7	49 15 6	48 9 -	9	70 18 8	64 19 8	13	14 19 -	14 9 -	2	1 7 -	1 5 -	
	31 Dec. 1872	6	47 10 -	46 14 -	15	124 9 1	101 10 8	8	8 4 -	8 1 -	5	3 3 -	3 3 -	
	30 June 1873	5	19 8 -	16 3 -	11	75 11 8	73 - 2	15	20 16 5	15 17 -	11	6 19 -	6 19 -	
	31 Dec. 1874	2	27 13 -	26 14 -	11	77 13 3	81 16 2	14	21 18 2	17 14 2	3	1 16 -	1 16 -	
FAVERSHAM	30 June 1874	9	230 3 8	78 11 -	3	18 - 6	17 5 6	25	27 7 9	24 15 -	5	2 19 -	2 18 -	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	8	51 - 4	36 19 10	2	2 19 -	2 2 -	2	2 11 6	1 7 -	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	3	23 13 10	15 11 4	6	10 9 6	7 3 -	1	13 6	11 -	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	1	8 13 -	5 19 6	-	-	-	-	1 -	13 -	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	3	24 9 2	16 17 10	2	2 8 -	2 - 9 4	1	18 -	12 -	
FOLKESTONE	31 Dec. 1874	-	-	-	2	16 14 9	11 10 2	5	6 13 6	5 19 6	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	1	19 4 10	19 - 10	4	25 7 2	12 15 8	12	10 16 -	10 16 -	1	2 -	10 -	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	1	6 12 6	4 8 6	8	7 4 -	7 4 -	4	2 -	2 -	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	5	24 9 2	13 0 6	7	6 6 -	6 6 -	3	1 10 -	1 10 -	
	30 June 1873	1	21 4 4	20 4 10	1	3 17 6	4 1 6	5	4 10 -	4 10 -	1	2 -	10 -	
GLOUCESTER	31 Dec. 1874	2	46 12 6	41 8 6	7	36 12 2	24 11 2	2	1 16 -	1 16 -	4	2 -	1 10 -	
	31 Dec. 1871	2	27 - 2	26 19 2	10	72 17 2	66 - 4	13	13 - 2	12 15 10	1	11 -	11 -	
	30 June 1872	3	44 5 -	43 15 -	10	58 19 9	50 11 10	23	23 1 -	22 12 6	2	1 2 -	1 2 -	
	31 Dec. 1873	2	88 18 8	78 17 2	14	96 9 1	86 9 3	20	19 12 6	19 11 6	4	2 6 -	2 6 -	
	30 June 1874	3	58 7 4	53 1 10	19	116 18 4	62 10 6	17	17 7 2	16 10 -	4	2 8 -	2 5 -	
GRANTHAM	31 Dec. 1874	1	19 19 10	18 7 4	8	60 17 11	60 3 5	21	21 11 -	20 14 -	5	2 17 -	2 17 -	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	3	21 5 6	13 14 6	3	3 7 -	3 7 -	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	1	9 18 2	7 6 8	2	9 8 8	9 1 10	1	1 -	1 -	1	15 -	13 -	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	6	33 4 1	29 16 10	2	2 1 -	2 1 -	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	2	13 10 9	13 4 3	2	2 2 -	2 2 -	-	-	-	
GRAVESEND	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	4	29 15 5	28 17 5	4	3 14 -	3 14 -	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	5	25 13 6	23 6 4	4	3 18 -	3 18 -	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	1	27 7 4	25 11 4	4	32 1 10	21 6 4	16	14 14 10	13 12 10	4	2 2 -	2 1 -	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	2	19 2 -	13 18 6	10	8 15 6	8 6 6	1	12 -	12 -	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	3	14 16 -	10 14 6	15	14 19 6	14 15 -	2	1 8 -	1 5 -	
GRAVESEND	30 June 1873	2	55 11 -	53 19 2	6	40 1 -	31 14 -	7	7 4 2	7 3 2	1	12 -	12 -	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	3	24 6 4	20 14 8	16	15 16 -	15 16 -	2	1 4 -	1 4 -	
	30 June 1874	1	17 1 6	16 13 -	3	21 -	14 9 -	12	12 8 2	12 7 2	4	2 8 -	2 8 -	

GUILDFORD

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HARWICH

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HASTINGS

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HAVERFORDWEST

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HAVERING-ATTE-BOWER
(LIBERTY)

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HELSTON

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HEREFORD

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HULL

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

HYTHE

31 Dec. 1871
30 June 1872
31 Dec. 1872
30 June 1873
31 Dec. 1873
30 June 1874

No return received.

No return.

No returns received.

No returns received.

[illegible]

[illegible]

Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in *England* and *Wales* during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874—*continued*.

BOROUGH.	Half Years ending	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.	
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.		
RIPON (LIBERTY)	31 Dec. 1871	-	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	14 8 1	19 16 9	2	2	3 6 3	2 15 9	-	1	1 10 6	18 6	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	6 14 3	4 6 4	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	28 2 -	33 11 1	3	5	5 19 4	5 1 4	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	36 - 1	50 13 1	2	2	4 1 9	3 9 9	-	-	-	-	
ROCHESTER	30 June 1874	-	-	-	8 18 -	13 6 11	2	2	3 6 -	2 - 4	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	42 17 8	42 13 -	6	6	9 17 -	9 6 6	-	-	1 14 -	1 14 -	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	32 2 -	40 2 10	5	11	10 17 6	10 17 6	2	2	1 3 -	1 3 -	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	12 - -	16 10 4	2	12	13 11 -	13 1 -	2	3	2 1 6	2 1 6	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	48 5 6	62 4 -	7	12	12 11 2	12 11 2	3	1	13 -	13 -	
ROMNEY MARSH (LIBERTY)	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	27 15 6	36 1 6	4	13	14 14 6	14 10 -	1	2	1 3 -	1 3 -	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	20 12 6	29 - -	4	10	11 11 6	11 11 6	2	-	-	-	Nil return. ditto.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	13 16 4	18 14 10	4	-	1 - -	18 -	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto. Return not received.
RYE	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Return not received. ditto.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	3 2 6	6 11 -	1	3	1 3 -	1 1 -	-	-	-	-	
SAFFRON WALDEN	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	4 3 6	14 15 6	2	3	3 10 -	3 4 -	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3 17 2	3 11 2	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
ST. ALBAN'S (LIBERTY)	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
SALISBURY	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	149 6 11	182 15 3	22	17	25 6 2	21 4 7	1	1	1 3 -	1 3 -	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	57 3 3	72 - 1	10	23	28 18 2	24 10 10	1	1	10 -	10 -	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	71 14 1	96 1 1	12	26	32 18 5	30 4 5	1	1	12 -	12 -	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	40 18 4	48 11 10	7	11	16 12 6	13 11 6	11	11	19 -	5 10 -	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	58 1 4	73 4 8	10	20	27 14 8	16 10 2	1	1	11 6 -	1 15 -	
SALISBURY	30 June 1874	-	-	-	90 14 6	115 19 10	17	21	29 1 8	24 7 2	7	7	7 4 -	2 14 -	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	5 12 8	5 18 4	1	8	8 9 -	6 17 -	1	1	12 -	11 -	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	10 7 4	11 4 6	2	3	2 16 -	2 15 -	7	7	3 18 -	2 17 -	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	12 7 10	13 11 6	2	19	19 10 -	16 1 -	1	1	4 -	18 6 -	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	2 3 10	2 1 10	4	4	2 4 -	2 4 -	
SALISBURY	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	23 11 10	29 5 10	6	6	8 5 2	6 5 4	-	1	1 3 -	1 3 -	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	18 17 9	21 10 10	3	6	7 9 6	6 14 6	2	-	-	-	

SANDWICH	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
SCARBOROUGH	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
SEAFORD	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
SHREWSBURY	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
SOUTHAMPTON	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
SOUTH MOLTON	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
STAMFORD	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
SUDBURY	31 Dec. 1871	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100

Return of the Costs of Prosecutions in *England and Wales* during the Six Half Years ending on the 30th June 1874—continued.

BOROUGH.	Half Years ending	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT.			JUVENILE OFFENDERS ACTS.			REMARKS.
		No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	No.	Claimed.	Allowed.	
TENTERDEN	31 Dec. 1871	-	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	-	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	-	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	-	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	Nil returns.
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TEWKESBURY	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Return not received.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
THETFORD	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Returns not received.
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TIVERTON	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Nil return.
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOWER OF LONDON (LIBERTY).	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Return not received.
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Returns not received.
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. "	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOWER: CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
WALSALL	31 Dec. 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No returns.
	30 June 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

WARWICK -	31 Dec. 1871	1	18 11	6	13 1	5	47 13 3	32 18 6	13	13 4	14 13 6	1	12	10
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	3	34 1 8	26 19 8	11	16 3 10	12 18 6	-	-	-
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	3	22 1 6	19 4 -	11	14 13 6	11 18 -	-	2 1	1 18
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	6	70 8 5	62 13 8	13	19 3 4	12 9 -	-	15	11
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	1	10 15 10	8 18 -	11	15 18 -	12 9 -	-	-	-
WENLOCK -	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	2	16 8 9	16 1 3	5	6 16 6	6 16 6	2	1 5	11
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	31 Dec. 1873	-	-	-	-	3	20 17 3	20 11 3	5	6 11 11	6 11 11	-	18	14
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	4	23 9 5	23 7 5	8	7 19 6	7 19 6	-	-	-
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	5	38 - 11	38 - 11	3	4 8 9	4 8 9	-	12	12
	30 June 1872	-	-	-	-	1	4 19 6	4 19 6	6	7 9 9	7 9 9	-	-	-
WIGAN -	31 Dec. 1871	5	75 -	5	60 8 3	14	97 12 9	89 9 7	39	40 16 4	40 16 4	9	5 17 6	5 17 6
	30 June 1872	1	48 8 4	4	47 18 4	15	100 10 11	92 9 2	25	26 3 6	26 3 6	8	5 3 2	5 3 2
	31 Dec. 1873	5	105 13 6	6	104 16 4	9	68 3 10	62 - 3	34	33 14 -	33 14 -	7	4 12 -	4 12 -
	30 June 1874	3	85 6 -	4	74 14 4	17	173 17 4	161 9 8	30	28 6 9	28 6 9	4	2 14 8	2 14 8
	31 Dec. 1871	3	44 18 4	4	44 10 10	14	96 10 10	89 4 4	37	35 18 -	35 18 -	15	9 1 -	9 1 -
	30 June 1872	3	77 15 2	2	77 15 2	16	127 14 5	118 2 4	23	23 16 8	23 16 8	14	8 6 -	8 6 -
WINCHESTER -	31 Dec. 1871	2	16 4 10	10	15 8 6	2	16 3 4	14 12 2	12	13 8 -	13 8 -	-	3 4 -	3 4 -
	30 June 1872	5	48 1 2	2	44 11 9	2	10 13 6	10 7 6	20	22 12 -	22 12 -	5	14 -	14 -
	31 Dec. 1873	5	38 4 6	6	37 3 10	3	86 5 8	71 13 -	15	15 14 -	15 14 -	1	-	-
	30 June 1874	2	13 17 -	-	12 13 6	7	42 13 8	47 1 6	10	10 5 -	10 5 -	1	14 -	14 -
	31 Dec. 1871	1	15 6 2	2	23 12 8	8	37 18 8	37 7 6	15	16 5 -	16 5 -	4	2 1 -	2 1 -
WINDSOR -	31 Dec. 1871	1	37 2 3	3	36 - 3	4	39 14 2	30 11 10	45	45 - 1	45 - 1	2	1 1 -	1 1 -
	30 June 1872	2	37 2 3	3	36 - 3	3	23 11 7	19 12 8	10	9 5 -	9 5 -	2	1 1 -	1 1 -
	31 Dec. 1873	4	23 5 3	3	22 6 11	6	101 15 10	86 1 10	4	4 6 6	4 6 6	-	-	-
	30 June 1874	1	11 18 0	0	11 18 -	3	28 10 5	23 13 3	17	15 19 6	15 18 -	-	-	-
	31 Dec. 1871	4	37 16 11	11	37 13 5	16	104 4 2	99 19 2	35	35 11 6	35 11 6	9	5 2 -	5 2 -
WOLVERHAMPTON -	31 Dec. 1871	6	80 15 -	2	28 15 8	13	181 16 -	137 18 -	34	34 2 -	34 2 -	9	5 1 -	5 1 -
	30 June 1872	3	29 2 2	2	30 11 7	41	361 8 5	233 19 10	43	44 8 6	44 8 6	12	7 2 -	7 2 -
	31 Dec. 1873	1	73 16 9	9	73 1 9	13	83 6 7	174 13 6	21	21 2 6	21 2 6	9	4 15 -	4 15 -
	30 June 1874	2	38 11 11	11	38 11 11	22	200 18 -	196 13 -	46	46 9 -	46 9 -	11	6 6 -	6 6 -
	31 Dec. 1871	4	59 16 10	10	59 4 6	11	116 8 6	79 19 1	12	11 9 -	11 9 -	4	2 -	2 -
WORCESTER -	31 Dec. 1871	3	38 19 -	-	38 11 -	17	107 17 -	99 14 6	15	14 7 -	14 7 -	3	1 12 -	1 12 -
	30 June 1872	7	75 8 -	-	63 2 2	17	120 2 -	104 13 5	15	14 15 -	14 15 -	2	1 1 -	1 1 -
	31 Dec. 1873	1	26 2 4	4	25 17 2	11	76 5 8	65 5 2	11	10 3 -	10 3 -	4	2 2 -	2 2 -
	30 June 1874	7	56 18 10	10	56 10 10	13	72 7 3	74 9 -	12	11 3 -	11 3 -	3	1 10 -	1 10 -
	31 Dec. 1871	1	18 17 6	6	18 - 6	18	116 10 10	114 - 10	36	36 6 -	36 6 -	2	1 4 -	1 4 -
YARMOUTH -	31 Dec. 1871	3	32 8 -	-	28 4 -	12	66 2 8	64 13 2	20	20 1 -	20 1 -	6	3 16 -	3 16 -
	30 June 1872	1	6 1 -	-	5 5 -	20	131 8 6	129 5 4	33	35 5 -	35 5 -	4	4 6 -	4 6 -
	31 Dec. 1873	3	28 11 11	11	26 13 11	21	127 19 2	127 3 8	30	32 1 6	32 1 6	7	4 6 -	4 6 -
	30 June 1874	2	58 2 10	10	54 2 -	19	147 -	128 5 8	23	26 13 2	26 13 2	3	2 13 -	2 13 -
	31 Dec. 1871	2	15 3 2	2	14 9 2	8	56 5 7	46 3 3	35	33 11 6	33 11 6	6	3 -	3 -
YORK -	31 Dec. 1871	1	13 13 -	-	10 1 8	6	34 5 6	33 8 6	23	22 1 8	22 1 8	8	5 10 -	5 10 -
	30 June 1872	1	8 16 -	-	8 13 -	5	29 16 -	17 17 6	26	23 9 -	23 9 -	4	2 -	2 -
	31 Dec. 1873	1	8 - 8	-	7 18 -	2	19 8 2	16 2 6	33	31 10 1	31 10 1	1	2 -	2 -
	30 June 1874	-	-	-	-	9	57 4 7	59 19 -	27	26 7 6	26 7 6	12	6 6 -	6 6 -
	31 Dec. 1871	-	-	-	-	10	118 1 3	99 19 8	26	32 13 8	32 13 8	12	6 6 -	6 6 -

STATEMENT of DISALLOWANCES under the following Heads, from the Returns of CRIMINAL PROSECUTION
EXPENSES for the Years, 1872 and 1873.

COUNTIES.

COUNTY.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
BEDFORD - - -	1872	2 5 6	- - -	3 13 9	- 10 6	- - -	4 8 4	- 2 -
	1873	- 7 6	- - -	3 11 2	- 8 6	- - -	- 10 6	- 4 -
BERKS - - -	1872	2 15 -	- - -	- 10 1	4 15 10	- - -	5 7 6	- 3 -
	1873	3 19 6	- - -	1 1 6	5 19 -	- - -	4 6 -	2 8 -
BUCKS - - -	1872	6 17 6	- - -	9 5 6	13 7 -	- - -	1 19 3	1 11 2
	1873	12 17 6	- - -	5 18 10	7 16 -	- - -	- 15 2	- 6 -
CAMBRIDGE - - -	1872	2 11 6	- - -	3 4 11	3 13 6	- - -	5 3 2	2 4 6
	1873	1 5 -	- - -	- 18 2	2 7 -	- - -	4 9 9	- 3 -
CHESTER - - -	1872	2 18 -	- - -	16 14 -	16 11 6	- - -	24 18 9	- - -
	1873	4 16 -	- - -	14 4 2	10 15 6	- - -	17 2 11	- - -
CORNWALL - - -	1872	2 3 -	- - -	2 13 2	- 10 6	- - -	2 7 -	- 14 6
	1873	1 19 -	- - -	3 5 10	- 7 6	- - -	- 14 6	- 11 -
CUMBERLAND - - -	1872	5 - 6	- - -	3 8 2	3 3 6	- - -	2 17 11	32 11 6
	1873	4 - -	- - -	5 14 10	3 2 -	- - -	2 16 9	35 4 4
DERBY - - -	1872	11 - -	- - -	12 9 3	21 2 -	- - -	13 17 6	41 3 -
	1873	7 9 6	- - -	6 13 4	17 12 6	- - -	10 18 8	40 19 -
DEVON - - -	1872	6 6 6	- - -	6 2 1	4 6 6	- - -	7 18 -	2 9 6
	1873	4 7 6	- - -	7 4 7	3 9 6	- - -	8 8 -	3 2 4
DORSET - - -	1872	2 16 -	- - -	3 10 6	13 10 6	- - -	6 16 10	48 5 8
	1873	8 16 6	- - -	4 11 6	6 15 -	- - -	5 10 10	47 16 10
DURHAM - - -	1872	3 6 -	- - -	7 13 1	8 2 -	- - -	8 - 2	- - -
	1873	- 16 6	- - -	5 3 3	2 5 6	1 3 6	9 15 11	- - -
ESSEX - - -	1872	11 11 10	- - -	17 8 10	23 11 2	- - -	76 9 9	43 3 2
Central Criminal Court	"	6 - 2	- - -	1 4 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
ESSEX - - -	1873	6 4 8	- - -	8 8 7	23 15 5	- - -	38 3 11	32 5 -
Central Criminal Court	"	6 6 10	- - -	1 11 6	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
GLOUCESTER - - -	1872	1 14 6	- - -	1 18 6	5 3 -	2 2 -	9 18 8	15 11 -
	1873	- 16 6	- - -	1 15 -	2 18 -	- - -	8 10 3	19 12 6
HEREFORD - - -	1872	2 13 6	- - -	3 4 3	3 13 -	- - -	14 - 9	20 - 2
	1873	2 2 -	- - -	4 2 8	8 12 6	- - -	26 7 9	12 17 10
HERTFORD - - -	1872	4 13 -	- - -	6 6 4	6 18 6	- - -	8 15 6	18 7 4
	1873	5 10 -	- - -	6 15 7	8 12 6	- - -	14 13 6	22 2 7
HUNTINGDON - - -	1872	- 14 -	- - -	- - 6	2 11 6	- - -	- 6 4	2 9 4
	1873	- 19 6	- - -	- 4 6	2 1 6	- - -	- 15 6	7 6 8
KENT - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 6 -	- - -	- - -	4 2 2	- - -
Central Criminal Court	1872	- - -	- - -	- 8 6	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
KENT - - -	1873	- - -	- - -	- 8 6	- 15 -	- - -	1 12 4	- - -
Central Criminal Court	1873	- - -	- - -	- 14 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
LANCASTER - - -	1872	7 10 6	- - -	8 4 6	4 3 6	- - -	53 3 8	- - -
	1873	6 13 -	- - -	6 14 3	7 1 -	- - -	6 12 10	- - -

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—*continued*.

COUNTY.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
LEICESTER - - -	1872	1 6 6	- - -	3 - 3	4 19 6	- - -	14 8 7	52 2 6
	1873	3 11 6	- - -	7 15 4	4 11 6	- - -	11 10 10	44 15 -
LINCOLN (Holland) - -	1872	3 16 8	- - -	- - -	7 - 6	- - -	1 5 11	1 11 6
	1873	2 18 -	- - -	2 16 -	9 12 -	- - -	6 9 6	- - -
LINCOLN (Kesteven) -	1872	- 8 -	- - -	3 - 10	- 13 6	- - -	- 16 9	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- 5 4	- 18 6	- - -	- 3 6	- - -
LINCOLN (Lindsey) - -	1872	1 15 -	- - -	2 6 8	18 7 6	- - -	17 19 7	4 1 -
	1873	2 6 6	- - -	4 - 9	5 8 6	- - -	7 2 6	4 9 -
MIDDLESEX - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	7 10 6	- - -	62 17 3	39 8 8
Central Criminal Court	"	3 6 6	- - -	59 3 11	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
MIDDLESEX - - -	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	10 17 -	- - -	88 19 5	46 1 3
Central Criminal Court	"	7 15 6	- - -	58 15 2	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
MONMOUTH - - -	1872	- 16 -	- - -	- 14 6	4 5 6	- - -	44 12 4	1 11 6
	1873	- 14 8	- - -	1 12 -	4 1 6	- - -	49 4 9	- - -
NORFOLK - - -	1872	5 9 6	- - -	3 9 6	7 1 -	- - -	22 3 4	- - -
	1873	7 2 -	- - -	3 18 7	9 8 -	- - -	6 10 -	- - -
NORTHAMPTON - - -	1872	1 - -	- - -	13 1 7	3 6 6	- - -	11 16 8	- - -
	1873	1 19 -	- - -	3 10 1	1 10 -	- - -	12 1 9	- - -
NORTHUMBERLAND - -	1872	2 11 -	- - -	10 8 6	17 4 -	- - -	4 5 5	5 6 8
	1873	1 5 -	- - -	3 5 -	14 1 -	- - -	3 17 8	- - -
NOTTINGHAM - - -	1872	2 10 6	- - -	6 11 6	12 14 6	- - -	18 18 9	45 19 8
	1873	7 8 -	- - -	11 2 4	15 7 6	- - -	14 8 -	42 - 6
OXFORD - - -	1872	3 3 6	- - -	6 9 6	8 15 6	1 3 6	18 9 1	5 16 -
	1873	- 16 -	- - -	2 5 1	1 8 -	- - -	6 5 8	- - -
RUTLAND - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 8 6	- - -	- - -	1 1 10	4 19 2
	1873	- - -	- - -	- 1 6	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 14 8
SALOP - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	1 5 8	- - -	- - -	1 - 4	- - -
	1873	1 - -	- - -	- 10 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
SOMERSET - - -	1872	10 5 6	- - -	21 16 9	14 17 7	1 3 6	12 13 2	- - -
	1873	12 11 10	- - -	20 19 10	11 - -	- - -	2 14 4	- - -
SOUTHAMPTON - - -	1872	3 19 6	- - -	12 13 2	5 8 6	- - -	7 14 10	- - -
	1873	5 10 6	- - -	11 5 2	3 5 6	- - -	19 2 10	- - -
STAFFORD - - -	1872	1 11 6	- - -	1 17 1	5 13 -	- - -	53 3 4	- - -
	1873	1 18 -	- - -	- 7 -	1 15 6	- - -	26 2 -	- - -
SUFFOLK (East Division)	1872	3 15 6	- - -	2 6 6	6 7 6	- - -	3 14 7	4 8 -
	1873	3 2 -	- - -	2 4 -	9 - -	- - -	3 3 8	8 7 10
SUFFOLK (West Division)	1872	- 7 6	- - -	- 15 6	4 6 6	- - -	2 12 6	4 19 -
	1873	- 15 6	- - -	2 10 8	2 7 -	- - -	4 2 11	2 15 -
SURREY - - -	1872	2 3 -	- - -	27 16 6	8 15 6	- - -	21 7 5	31 12 -
Central Criminal Court	"	- 8 -	- - -	11 6 6	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
SURREY - - -	1873	- 10 6	- - -	1 1 2	2 11 -	- - -	7 13 2	29 13 -
Central Criminal Court	"	- 2 -	- - -	- 6 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
SUSSEX (East) - - -	1872	1 1 4	- - -	1 15 4	- 6 8	- - -	5 18 8	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	3 19 4	- - -	- - -	11 4 8	- - -

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—continued.

[illegible]

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—*continued*.

BOROUGH S.

BOROUGH.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
ABINGDON - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 12 6	- - -	- 11 -	- 1 -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 6 6	- - -	- - -	- 1 -
ANDOVER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 2 6	- - -	- - -	- 15 6
	1873	- 2 -	- - -	- 1 -	- 4 -	- - -	- 6 6	- 6 6
BANBURY - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 4 6	- - -	- 3 -	- - -
	1873	- 8 6	- - -	- - -	- 9 2	- - -	- 7 -	- 2 -
BARNSTAPLE - - -	1872	- 2 -	- - -	- - -	- 2 -	- - -	1 3 3	3 12 2
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 18 6	- - -	4 10 6	4 8 -
BATH - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 10 6	- 7 -	- - -	6 4 6	13 13 -
	1873	- - -	- - -	1 11 6	- - -	- - -	5 16 -	22 13 -
BEAUMARIS - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 8 -	- - -	- 5 6	- 14 6
	1873	- 14 -	- - -	- - -	- 9 -	- - -	1 - -	1 - 2
BEDFORD - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	2 7 -	- - -	- 9 6	1 19 -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 - -	- - -	- - -	1 9 6
BERWICK - - -	1872	- 7 6	- - -	- - 6	- 1 -	- - -	- - -	2 1 6
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 14 -	- - -	- - -	4 2 6
BIDEFORD - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 6 -	- - -	- 6 6	2 6 -
	1873	- 7 -	- - -	- 2 -	- 5 6	- - -	- - -	1 7 6
BIRMINGHAM - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	2 2 -	- 2 6	- - -	3 4 -	22 8 -
	1873	- 3 -	- - -	6 - -	- 5 -	- - -	3 13 6	20 9 5
BOLTON - - -	1872	1 - -	- - -	- 3 4	8 5 -	- - -	3 3 3	- - -
	1873	- 3 -	- - -	1 - -	1 4 -	- - -	- - -	- - -
BRIDGNORTH - - -	1872	- 3 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 2 6	- - -	- 3 -	- 5 6
BRIDGWATER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 10 6	- - -	- - -	1 4 6
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 2 6	- - -	- 2 6	- 7 -
BRIGHTON - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 16 -	- - -	1 11 -	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	1 1 -	- 5 -	- - -	- 8 -	- - -
BRISTOL - - -	1872	2 5 6	- - -	10 7 -	6 7 6	- - -	10 1 10	103 2 6
	1873	1 11 -	- - -	- 10 -	3 13 6	- - -	8 4 -	101 1 6
BUCKINGHAM - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
BURY ST. EDMUNDS - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 2 -	- - -	- 1 -	3 3 6
	1873	- 1 -	- - -	- - -	- 4 -	- - -	- - -	- 17 6
CAMBRIDGE - - -	1872	2 6 6	- - -	7 1 10	5 2 -	- - -	10 15 10	13 6 -
	1873	1 5 2	- - -	3 12 6	5 15 -	- - -	12 17 9	13 4 -
CANTERBURY - - -	1872	- 3 -	- - -	- - -	2 5 -	- - -	- 12 -	14 3 -
	1873	- 8 -	- - -	- - -	1 8 -	- - -	- 1 -	10 8 6
CARLISLE - - -	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 5 -	- - -	- 6 6	3 11 2
CARMARTHEN - - -	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- 18 6	- - -	- - -	1 6 9	- - -	- 13 6	- 18 -

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—continued.

BOROUGH.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.				Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.		
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
CHESTER - - -	1872	2 8 6	- - -	- 1 -	7 12 -	- - -	- 9 -	11 19 6	
	1873	1 11 6	- - -	1 19 6	5 12 -	- - -	1 5 -	12 9 -	
CHICHESTER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 9 -	- - -	1 13 -	6 3 -	
	1873	- 12 6	- - -	- 6 -	- 13 6	- - -	- 1 -	5 15 -	
COLCHESTER - - -	1872	1 10 6	- - -	- - -	9 15 -	- - -	2 17 -	17 14 6	
	1873	1 6 6	- - -	- 9 10	7 7 6	- - -	2 1 -	16 12 2	
DARTMOUTH - - -	1872	No return.							
	1873	ditto.							
DEAL - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 2 6	- 10 -	- - -	- - -	6 16 9	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	2 11 8	
DERBY - - -	1872	- 5 6	- - -	- - -	- 8 -	- - -	- 13 10	29 3 6	
	1873	- 11 6	- - -	- 2 6	1 - -	- - -	1 5 7	31 17 -	
DEVIZES - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 2 -	- - -	1 13 6	- 12 -	
	1873	- 1 -	- - -	1 2 -	- 3 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	
DEVONPORT - - -	1872	- 4 -	- - -	- 2 -	1 3 6	- - -	- 10 -	20 10 -	
	1873	- 4 6	- - -	- 3 -	1 2 6	- - -	2 13 -	24 10 6	
DONCASTER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	3 10 6	- - -	7 16 11	3 11 6	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	2 18 6	- - -	8 10 8	5 3 -	
DOVER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 15 6	- - -	3 - 6	2 12 6	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- 5 -	1 - -	- - -	12 5 2	4 14 6	
ELY, ISLE OF (Liberty) -	1872	5 10 6	- - -	1 6 8	10 5 -	- - -	16 18 11	52 3 10	
	1873	3 3 6	- - -	- 10 -	14 18 6	- - -	67 13 -	90 19 10	
EXETER - - -	1872	- 1 6	- - -	1 1 -	- 9 -	- - -	8 3 11	3 4 -	
	1873	- 3 -	- - -	- 16 -	1 7 6	- - -	- 14 10	2 17 6	
FAVERSHAM - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 12 6	- - -	- - -	3 17 6	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 2 -	- - -	6 6 -	2 7 8	
FOLKESTONE - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 11 -	- - -	- - -	1 13 -	
	1873	- 19 6	- - -	- - -	1 7 6	- - -	3 - 2	6 3 6	
GLOUCESTER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 10 -	- 1 -	- - -	- 16 11	2 18 -	
	1873	- - -	- - -	2 17 6	- - -	- - -	5 8 10	3 9 6	
GRANTHAM - - -	1872	- 3 -	- - -	2 8 6	1 2 6	- - -	- 8 7	- - -	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 17 -	- - -	- 7 6	- - -	
GRAVESEND - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 3 -	- - -	- 9 -	2 - 6	
	1873	- 8 6	- - -	- 8 4	1 7 6	- - -	- 15 -	2 10 6	
GUILDFORD - - -	1872	1 5 -	- - -	- - -	2 6 6	- - -	- - -	- 17 -	
	1873	1 5 6	- - -	- 1 -	1 17 -	- - -	- - -	- 18 6	
HARWICH - - -	1872	- 4 -	- - -	- - -	- 8 6	- - -	1 3 -	1 10 6	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 12 6	- - -	1 1 10	3 - 7	
HASTINGS - - -	1872	- 3 6	- - -	- 11 8	1 8 -	- - -	1 17 -	12 15 -	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- 4 -	1 4 6	- - -	- 15 3	20 11 6	
HAVERFORDWEST - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 9 -	- - -	- 16 4	2 12 6	
	1873	No return.							
HAVERING-ATTE-BOWER (Liberty).	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 4 6	- - -	- - -	- 8 -	
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 18 -	- - -	- 3 -	1 10 6	

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—continued.

BOROUGH.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
HELSTON	1872	-	No return.					
	1873	-	ditto.					
HEREFORD	1872	-	-	- 1 -	- 7 8	-	1 1 6	13 6 -
	1873	-	-	- 7 -	- 10 -	-	1 3 -	10 14 6
HULL	1872	1 19 -	-	- 14 -	82 3 9	-	40 12 1	207 4 -
	1873	2 - -	-	- 6 -	84 7 -	-	42 14 2	208 19 6
LYTHE	1872	-	-	-	- 1 6	-	- 4 -	3 10 6
	1873	- 1 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
PSWICH	1872	1 8 -	-	- 3 -	5 6 4	-	- 13 -	4 8 2
	1873	- 12 -	-	-	5 14 -	-	1 6 2	29 11 6
KIDWELLY	1872	- 15 -	-	- 1 -	-	-	-	-
	1873	-	No return.					
KING'S LYNN	1872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	-	-	-	2 10 -	-	- 3 -	7 - 4
LEEDS	1872	2 8 -	-	- 19 6	1 14 -	-	3 2 -	3 -
	1873	1 15 -	-	3 13 -	2 15 6	-	3 8 4	-
LEICESTER	1872	7 8 -	-	4 16 6	54 12 8	-	20 17 8	65 7 2
	1873	6 - 6	-	23 14 6	48 10 4	-	12 8 -	57 14 -
LICHFIELD	1872	- 10 -	-	-	1 12 -	-	2 2 10	6 10 6
	1873	-	-	-	- 1 6	-	- 6 -	3 13 6
LINCOLN	1872	1 4 6	-	2 5 6	2 2 -	-	3 4 6	- 10 -
	1873	- 2 -	-	- 18 9	3 11 2	-	3 11 2	2 15 -
LIVERPOOL	1872	-	-	5 8 8	- 6 -	-	- 10 -	-
	1873	- 2 -	-	-	- 5 -	-	3 3 -	-
LONDON: Central Criminal Court	1872	-	-	19 10 -	-	-	-	-
	1873	-	-	28 1 -	-	-	-	-
LUDLOW	1872	-	-	-	-	-	- 4 -	2 16 6
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	- 8 6	3 5 6
LYDD	1872	-	No return.					
	1873	-	ditto.					
MAIDSTONE	1872	- 2 4	-	-	3 13 4	-	-	4 19 10
	1873	- - 8	-	-	1 4 8	-	- 15 -	1 18 -
MANCHESTER	1872	1 2 6	-	- 3 6	5 2 -	-	2 3 5	-
	1873	- 7 6	-	1 13 -	4 1 -	-	- 6 6	-
MARGATE	1872	-	-	-	2 9 -	-	- 1 6	5 9 6
	1873	- 6 -	-	- 12 -	- 13 6	-	1 8 5	1 6 6
NEWARK	1872	-	-	-	- 8 6	-	- 8 -	2 3 6
	1873	-	-	-	- 1 -	-	-	- 4 6
NEWBURY	1872	-	-	-	- 4 -	-	- 18 6	1 14 6
	1873	- 6 -	-	-	- 9 -	-	- 7 -	1 19 6
NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME	1872	-	-	-	- 7 -	-	1 1 -	-
	1873	- 2 6	-	-	1 8 6	-	1 17 10	- 8 6
NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE	1872	- 6 -	-	-	- 9 -	-	- 5 -	-
	1873	- 13 -	-	- 5 -	1 4 -	-	6 7 6	-

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—*continued.*

BOROUGH.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.				Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular not Payable by Prosecution or in Excess of Scales.
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.		
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
NORTHAMPTON	1872	18 6	- -	- -	1 2	- -	23 4	33 4	
	1873	3	- -	2 2	2 7 8	- -	31 10	31 14	
NORWICH	1872	13 6	- -	- -	3 6	- -	1 16	- -	
	1873	6	- -	5	4 19 6	- -	3 18	2 10	
NOTTINGHAM	1872	2 7 6	- -	1 18	5 19	- -	5 11 6	42 16 6	
	1873	7 8	- -	4 19 9	1 7	- -	3 5	10 2 6	
OSWESTRY	1872	-	- -	- -	2	- -	- 5	- 6	
	1873	-	- -	- -	-	- -	- 6	- 3	
OXFORD	1872	-	- -	- -	18	- -	3 11	1 18 6	
	1873	No return.			-	- -	-	-	
PENZANCE	1872	-	- -	- -	1 6	- -	-	1 11 6	
	1873	-	- -	- -	4	- -	-	-	
PETERBOROUGH (Liberty)	1872	-	- -	- -	5 12 6	- -	5 8	- 5	
	1873	-	- -	- -	1 1 6	- -	11 6	-	
PEVENSEY (Liberty)	1872	6	- -	6	-	- -	-	-	
	1873	-	- -	-	-	- -	-	-	
PLYMOUTH	1872	-	- -	14	1 9	- -	5 17 6	2 5	
	1873	1 1	- -	2 19 10	15 4	- -	4 2	1 7 6	
PONTEFRAC	1872	-	- -	- -	2	- -	15 6	6 2 6	
	1873	-	- -	- -	2 6	- -	2	12 1	
POOLE	1872	4	- -	1 11 2	13 6	- -	8	17 6	
	1873	-	- -	-	12 6	- -	1 6	8	
PORTSMOUTH	1872	-	- -	13 3	1 9 6	- -	14 6	98 14	
	1873	-	- -	1 7 4	-	- -	6 6	73 3 0	
READING	1872	13	- -	5	3 3	- -	3 6	9	
	1873	1 6	- -	-	18	- -	12 3	7 5	
RICHMOND	1872	-	- -	- -	6	- -	-	14 6	
	1873	-	- -	- -	3 6	- -	-	4	
RIPON (Liberty)	1872	-	- -	-	-	- -	-	-	
	1873	-	- -	-	3 13	- -	1 12	-	
ROCHESTER	1872	-	- -	- -	2 11 2	- -	6	3 1 6	
	1873	-	- -	- -	4 15 2	- -	1 11 10	2 17 6	
ROMNEY MARSH (Liberty)	1872	-	- -	- -	-	- -	- 6	7 3 2	
	1873	-	- -	-	-	- -	-	-	
RYE	1872	-	- -	- -	-	- -	1	16	
	1873	-	- -	- -	1 1	- -	1 12	1 4 6	
SAFFRON WALDEN	1872	No return.			-	- -	-	-	
	1873	ditto.			-	- -	-	-	
ST. ALBANS (Liberty)	1872	4 6	- -	4 8	5 5	- -	2 12 8	19 14	
	1873	2 19	- -	1 19 7	9 9 6	- -	2 3	13 15 4	
SALISBURY	1872	7	- -	-	1	- -	9 6	19 6	
	1873	13	- -	15 11	7	- -	16	1 3	
SANDWICH	1872	-	- -	- -	3 1	- -	13 2	10 11 6	
	1873	-	- -	1	4 8 6	- -	2 6	13 19	

STATEMENT of Disallowances from Returns of Criminal Prosecution Expenses, for the Years 1872 and 1873—continued.

BOROUGH.	Years.	ASSIZES.			SESSIONS.			
		Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Justices' Clerks' Fees.	Counsel for Drawing Indictment.	Non-observance of Scales, and Regulations of Secretary of State.	Court Fees, Obsolete and Irregular, not Payable by Prosecutor, or in Excess of Scales.
		£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
CARBOROUGH - -	1872	1 4 -	- - -	- 9 6	3 4 -	- - -	14 16 10	21 17 -
	1873	1 2 -	- - -	- - -	2 11 6	1 3 6	14 6 -	29 19 -
EAUFORD - - -	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- ditto.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
HREWSBURY - -	1872	- 4 -	- - -	- - -	- 13 -	- - -	- 13 -	3 6 6
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 9 -	- - -	- 13 6	3 - -
OUTHAMPTON - -	1872	- 9 6	- - -	- 6 6	- 16 -	- - -	4 4 3	9 3 6
	1873	1 7 -	- - -	16 10 -	- 14 6	2 7 -	4 19 2	46 5 6
OUTH MOLTON - -	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- ditto.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
TAMFORD - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 9 -	- - -	- 11 4	1 9 -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 3 -	- - -	- 11 -	1 - -
UDBURY - - - -	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 12 -	- - -	- - -	- - -
ENTERDEN - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
EWKESBURY - -	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- ditto.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
HETFORD - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 7 6	- - -	- 4 6	1 4 -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 18 6	- - -	- 6 -	5 6 6
LIVERTON - - -	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 2 6	- - -	- 8 -	- 13 -
TOWER OF LONDON (Liberty.)	1872	- No return.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1873	- ditto.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
WALSALL - - - -	1872	- 7 -	- - -	- 2 -	2 4 -	- - -	- 19 6	11 15 6
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 1 -	- - -	- 3 -	5 13 6
WARWICK - - - -	1872	- 5 -	- - -	- 5 6	1 9 -	- - -	- 1 -	3 1 -
	1873	- 8 6	- - -	- 14 4	2 11 6	- - -	- 4 -	3 - 6
WENLOCK - - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 6 -
	1873	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- 1 4	- 1 6
WIGAN - - - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 11 2	- 5 -	- - -	- 5 -	11 19 4
	1873	- 1 -	- - -	5 13 2	- 19 6	- - -	1 11 -	15 17 2
WINCHESTER - -	1872	- 18 8	- - -	- 12 9	- 13 6	- - -	- - -	1 - -
	1873	- 10 6	- - -	- 1 6	1 2 10	- - -	- 1 8	- 2 -
WINDSOR - - - -	1872	1 - -	- - -	- 2 -	1 14 -	- - -	1 7 5	6 9 -
	1873	- 8 6	- - -	- 9 10	2 10 8	- - -	- 2 -	4 17 -
WOLVERHAMPTON	1872	- - -	- - -	- 10 -	1 12 -	- - -	5 - 10	- - -
	1873	- 10 -	- - -	- - -	- 7 6	- - -	6 15 -	- - -
WORCESTER - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 6	- 4 -	- - -	1 16 10	5 17 -
	1873	- 4 -	- - -	- 6 8	- 12 -	- - -	1 18 3	2 17 6
YARMOUTH - - -	1872	- - -	- - -	- 3 6	- - -	- - -	- 15 8	1 16 -
	1873	1 1 6	- - -	1 7 10	1 - -	- - -	6 1 4	1 1 -
YORK - - - - -	1872	- 6 6	- - -	- 12 8	- 8 -	- - -	- 5 -	- 11 -
	1873	- 3 6	- - -	- - 6	1 2 -	- - -	- - -	2 16 6
TOTALS - - - £.		467 17 1	1 3 6	930 17 5	1,244 2 4	11 7 6	2,011 15 5	3,015 12 7

PROSECUTIONS.

RETURN

RELATIVE TO THE

COSTS OF PROSECUTIONS

IN

ENGLAND AND WALES.

(Mr. Gorst.)

(Mr. William Henry Smith.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
1 June 1875.

235.

Under 3 oz.

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

September 1872 and December 1873

CONTAINING

SUGGESTIONS

MADE TO THE

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

UPON

BILL [203.], SESS. 1872, AND BILL [173.], SESS. 1873.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.



LONDON:

PRINTED BY GEORGE EDWARD EYRE AND WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
PRINTERS TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1875.

[C.—1319.] Price 1s.

BILL [203.], SESSION 1872.

A Bill [as amended in Committee] for the appointment of a Public Prosecutor and better Administration of Justice. A.D. 1872.

WHEREAS it is expedient to provide for the appointment of public prosecutors, and otherwise for the more effectual prosecution of indictable offences :

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :

Preliminary.

1. This Act may be cited as the "Public Prosecutors Act, 1872."
2. This Act shall not extend to Scotland or to Ireland.

Short title.

Extent of Act.

Duties of Public Prosecutors.

3. It shall be the duty of a public prosecutor for a county or borough, subject to the regulations made under this Act, to conduct the prosecution of persons committed for trial for any of the offences mentioned in the first schedule to this Act which has been committed within such county or borough, or within such district as may be assigned to such public prosecutor by a Secretary of State, and also to institute and conduct such other prosecution or criminal proceeding as he may be required, in pursuance of this Act, to institute or conduct.

Duties of and regulations respecting public prosecutors.

A Secretary of State may, from time to time, make, revoke, and alter regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this Act; and in particular for

- (1.) Determining what criminal proceedings public prosecutors are or are not to institute, or conduct, or appear in;
- (2.) Defining and regulating the duties of public prosecutors under this Act; and
- (3.) Prescribing anything authorised by this Act to be prescribed or provided by a Secretary of State, or by regulations under this Act.

A Secretary of State may also issue directions to any public prosecutor in reference to any matter done or to be done by such public prosecutor in pursuance of this Act.

4. Where any justices commit any person for trial, and it will be the duty of any public prosecutor to conduct the prosecution of such person, the clerk to the justices, if he is not such public prosecutor, shall forthwith transmit to such public prosecutor the depositions and recognizances in the case, and such other documents and things connected with the case, and give such information in reference to the case as such clerk thinks necessary, or may be required by the justices or by the public prosecutor so to transmit or give.

Documents and information to be given to public prosecutors.

Where a public prosecutor institutes or conducts any criminal proceeding before justices, the clerk to the justices, if he is not the public prosecutor, shall furnish to the public prosecutor, on demand by him, all such depositions, recognizances, documents, and things connected with the case, and give such information in reference to the case as the public prosecutor may require.

The coroner by whom any person is committed for trial shall certify the fact of such committal, and transmit all depositions taken before him, and the recognizances and other documents and things belonging to the case, to the proper public prosecutor.

The public prosecutor shall, subject to any regulations made under this Act, deliver or certify the said depositions, recognizances, documents, and things to the proper officer of the court in which the trial is to be had, in the manner in which they would but for this Act be delivered by the clerk to the justices or certified by the coroner, as the case may be.

Any question which may arise with respect to the transmission, delivery, or certifying of depositions, recognizances, documents, or things in pursuance of this section shall be decided by a Secretary of State, whose decision shall be final.

A.D. 1872.

Provision as to private prosecution.

5. Where a public prosecutor prosecutes any person for any offence, such prosecution shall, save as otherwise provided by this Act or by any regulation made thereunder, be conducted solely by such public prosecutor, and in any county or borough in which this Act is in operation no person shall be bound over by any justices or coroner to prefer a bill of indictment for any offence mentioned in the first schedule to this Act.

Provided that,—

- (1.) Any person may be associated in the prosecution with the public prosecutor in such manner and on such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State;
- (2.) Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person of any right of instituting or conducting any proceeding before justices, or of preferring an indictment against any alleged offender who has not been committed for trial, or of the right to be bound over to prosecute any alleged offender who is not committed for trial, or of preferring any indictment or conducting any prosecution for an offence which is not mentioned in the first schedule to this Act, or which a public prosecutor does not in fact prefer or conduct.

A public prosecutor shall effectually conduct every prosecution and proceeding which it is his duty in pursuance of this Act to institute or conduct, and shall not withdraw therefrom unless by leave of the court before whom the same is tried.

Where any person has reasonable cause to believe that a public prosecutor is not properly conducting or is not taking the means properly to conduct the prosecution for any offence, or that otherwise it is expedient for the administration of justice that he should be allowed to prosecute in lieu of the public prosecutor, such person may apply to one of Her Majesty's Superior Courts at Westminster, or any judge thereof, for leave to conduct the prosecution in lieu of the public prosecutor, and such court or judge, if satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for such application, may, if it seem fit, grant the same upon such conditions and limitations (if any) as to the court or judge may seem expedient for the due administration of justice; and thereupon such person may, subject to the said conditions and limitations (if any), conduct the prosecution in lieu of the public prosecutor, who shall, save as otherwise directed by such court or judge, cease to interfere therein.

The court before whom any prosecution is conducted by a person in lieu of the public prosecutor in pursuance of this section may, if the offender is convicted, order the costs of such prosecution to be paid by the public prosecutor, and all costs so paid shall be deemed to be costs of the public prosecutor properly incurred by him in the execution of his duties under this Act.

Appointment of Public Prosecutors.

Appointment and tenure of public prosecutors.

6. After this Act has come into operation in any county or borough, it shall be lawful for a Secretary of State from time to time to fix, with the concurrence of the Treasury, the number of public prosecutors for such county or borough, and to appoint, subject to such recommendation as herein-after mentioned, a fit person, being an attorney-at-law who either is a clerk to special and petty sessions or a clerk to justices in such county or borough, and is paid by salary, or who, not being such a clerk, has practised in such county or borough for not less than three years immediately previous to his appointment, to be a public prosecutor in such county or borough.

Every such public prosecutor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Secretary of State.

Recommendation by local authority as to public prosecutors.

7. The Secretary of State shall notify to the local authority of every county or borough every vacancy in the office of public prosecutor for such county or borough, and where there is more than one public prosecutor for such county or borough, the district in which such public prosecutor will be expected to act, and a recommendation of not less than three persons fit to be appointed to fill such vacancy may, from time to time, be made to the Secretary of State by the local authority of such county or borough, so, however, that regard be had to the district in which such public prosecutor will be required to act, and that in the case of a borough the recommendation be made with the consent of a majority of the justices of the borough present at a special sessions.

Upon such recommendation being made the Secretary of State shall fill the vacancy from among the persons so recommended, unless he is of opinion that none of the persons so recommended are suitable to be so appointed, but in such case he shall forthwith notify the same to the local authority, and the local authority may make another recommendation in like manner as if they had made none before.

If, from any cause, within six months after a vacancy is notified to the local authority, the local authority have failed to make such recommendation as enables the Secretary of State to fill up such vacancy, the Secretary of State may appoint a fit person to be a public prosecutor to fill the vacancy without any recommendation.

A.D. 1872.

Upon this Act first coming into operation in any county or borough each appointment to be made for such county or borough shall be deemed to constitute a vacancy within the meaning of this section.

Where this Act is in operation in two or more adjoining areas which have different local authorities the Secretary of State may appoint a person to be a public prosecutor for both, or all, or some of such arrears or parts thereof from among the persons recommended by the local authority of any of such areas, and for the purposes of this enactment a borough situate in a county shall be deemed to adjoin that county.

8. A public prosecutor may, subject to any regulations under this Act, appoint to act as his deputy a person qualified under this Act to be a public prosecutor.

Deputy and interim public prosecutor.

The Secretary of State may, at any time during a vacancy in the office of a public prosecutor for any place, appoint (at such remuneration as he may fix) a person temporarily to act as public prosecutor for such place until the vacancy is filled.

9. A public prosecutor shall not by himself, his partner or clerk, be employed or concerned as an attorney (otherwise than as public prosecutor) in any criminal proceeding other than a proceeding which a Secretary of State may allow as being in his opinion only of a quasi-criminal character, or act as an attorney or agent in matters connected with the registration of voters for members to serve in Parliament, or as agent for a candidate at an election of a member to serve in Parliament, or in any manner interfere in the election of a member to serve in Parliament otherwise than by acting as returning officer or voting at such election. If any public prosecutor act in contravention of or fail to comply with this section he shall be liable on summary conviction before two justices to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, and shall be disqualified for a term of not less than five years for acting as public prosecutor.

Restriction on private practice of public prosecutor.

Expenses and Costs.

10. There shall be paid to every public prosecutor such salary or remuneration as may from time to time be fixed by a Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Treasury; and that salary or remuneration, together with all costs properly incurred by such public prosecutor in accordance with the regulations under this Act in the execution of his duties under this Act, shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament; and all regulations under this Act which relate to the control or taxation of any expenses which are payable out of moneys provided by Parliament shall be made with the concurrence of the Treasury.

Salaries and expenses of public prosecutors.

11. After a public prosecutor has been appointed in any county or borough in pursuance of this Act the costs of the prosecution on indictment of any person for any of the offences mentioned in the first schedule to this Act shall not be ordered to be paid out of or be charged on or paid out of the county or other rate of such county or borough.

Exemption of locality from payment of costs of prosecution.

Provided that where a person was committed for trial for any such offence before the first appointment of such public prosecutor, the costs of the prosecution of such person, if it is not conducted by the public prosecutor, shall be paid in like manner as if this Act had not passed.

After a public prosecutor has been appointed in any county or borough in pursuance of this Act, the certificate of the costs payable under the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act to any prosecutor or witnesses, in the case of any offence committed in such county or borough, shall be transmitted to such persons and in such manner as may be prescribed by regulations made under this Act, and the amount of such costs when ascertained in manner prescribed by the said regulations shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament, and not out of any county or other local rate.

12. The public prosecutor shall, as soon as practicable after the trial of any person prosecuted by him, pay to witnesses (including witnesses for the accused) who appear on recognizance or subpoena to give evidence at such trial their expenses incurred in such attendance and in attending before the examining justices and the grand jury, and compensation for their trouble and loss of time therein, and shall pay to the prosecutor (if any) of such person before the justices the expenses incurred by such

Payment to witnesses.

A.D. 1872. — prosecutor therein, and compensation for his trouble and loss of time therein, and shall make such payments in accordance with the regulations for the time being in force in relation thereto under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851; and if any such witness or prosecutor as aforesaid feel aggrieved by any act of the public prosecutor in relation to the payment or nonpayment to him of any such expenses or compensation, he may apply to the court before whom the trial was had, and such court may order the payment to the applicant of such sum as the court may think justly due to the applicant, in accordance with the said regulations.

Clerks of the Peace and Justices Clerks.

Payment of
clerks by
salary under
14 & 15 Vict.
c. 55. s. 9.
made com-
pulsory.

13. Where, upon this Act coming into operation in any county or borough, any of the clerks in such county or borough to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies, is not paid wholly by salary, the justices, council, or other governing body, who under the said Act have power to make a recommendation with respect to the payment of such clerk by salary in lieu of fees, shall, within six months after this Act so comes into operation, make such a recommendation to a Secretary of State; and the Secretary of State shall make an order directing such payment; and if, in the case of any such clerk, such recommendation as enables a Secretary of State to make an order under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, is not received by the Secretary of State before the expiration of the said six months, the Secretary of State shall in like manner in all respects as if such recommendation had been duly made make an order under the said Act, directing the payment of such clerk by salary in lieu of fees for all his official business which is not excepted by such order, and fixing the amount of such salary.

Every such salary shall be deemed to accrue from day to day, but shall be paid quarterly, or at such less intervals as may be from time to time fixed by such justices, council, or other governing body.

Provided that the salary of any clerk of the peace appointed before the passing of this Act shall not at any time be fixed at any less sum than the average amount, to be proved to the satisfaction of a Secretary of State, of the salary, fees, and other payments and allowances actually received by such clerk, or by him and his predecessor in office, during the three years next before the passing of this Act, in respect of the official business for which such salary is to be paid: Provided further, that nothing in this section shall prejudice the right of any clerk of the peace to receive any increase of salary or compensation in the event of his being deprived of any house of residence or emoluments other than such fees, payments or allowances as aforesaid.

This section shall, so far as is consistent with the tenor thereof, be construed as one with sections nine, ten, eleven, and twelve of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851.

Making of
table of fees.

14. With respect to the fees to be taken after this Act comes into operation in any county or borough in respect of the official business of any clerk to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies or of any clerk to whom that section does not apply, and who is clerk of a stipendiary magistrate, or of special and petty sessions or of justices, or of any metropolitan police court, the following provisions shall have effect:

- (1.) Within six months after this Act comes into operation in any place, the justices, council, or other governing body who, under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, have authority to make a recommendation with respect to the payment of any of the said clerks within such place shall, and at any time after that date may, submit to a Secretary of State a table of the fees which they consider should be taken in respect of the official business of any of the said clerks within the jurisdiction of such justices, council, or other governing body, and may at any time submit to a Secretary of State any objections or representations respecting the table of fees for such official business then in force, or which is proposed to be made by a Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State shall consider every table, objection, and representation so sent to him.
- (2.) The Secretary of State, as soon as practicable after the receipt of any such recommendation made before the expiration of the said six months, or in default of such recommendation, as soon as practicable after the expiration of the said six months, shall make a table of the fees which he considers proper to be taken in respect of the official business of all the said clerks within the jurisdiction of the justices, council, or other governing body making such recommendation, or failing to make the same, as the case may be.

- (3.) A Secretary of State may from time to time, whether with or without the recommendation of the said justices, council, or other governing body, make a table of fees by way of alteration of, or addition to, or substitution for any table of fees made in pursuance of this section; and any table so made shall, so far as it does not supersede the table previously in force, form part thereof. A.D. 1872.
- (4.) The Secretary of State shall cause copies of every table of fees made in pursuance of this section to be transmitted to the justices, council, or other governing body within whose jurisdiction such fees are to be taken, and such copies shall be distributed by such justices, council, or other governing body among the clerks to whom any such table relates, and shall be affixed and made public in such manner as the authority distributing the same may think best calculated for giving information to the persons who are required to pay such fees, and in such other manner, if any, as a Secretary of State may direct.
- (5.) Every table of fees made in pursuance of this section shall come into operation at such date, not earlier than the date of its transmission to the justices, council, or other governing body, as may be fixed by the Secretary of State; and after the first table so made comes into operation the fees prescribed by that table or any other table superseding the same, and for the time being in force in pursuance of this section, and no other fees, whether authorised by or in pursuance of any Act or otherwise, may be taken in respect of the official business of the clerks to whom such table relates; and if any person take or demand any fee contrary to this provision, he shall be liable, on summary conviction before two justices, to a penalty not exceeding *twenty pounds*.

15. In the case of the clerks of the metropolitan police courts, and in the case of the clerk of any stipendiary magistrate whose fees are paid to the account of Her Majesty's Exchequer, and in any case in which for any cause there is no authority having power under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, to make a recommendation, a Secretary of State shall make the table of fees, and cause such table to be distributed and made public; and the provisions of this Act relating to such table shall be construed as if there were no reference to such local authority. Application to clerks of Act where no justices, &c.

Provided that where any body of persons other than the justices, council, or other governing body above mentioned in this Act would, but for the passing of this Act, have power to recommend a table of the fees to be taken by the clerk of any stipendiary magistrate, such body shall in the provisions of this Act with respect to tables of fees, be substituted for such justices.

16. The Act of the session of the twenty-third and twenty-fourth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter fifty-one, intituled "An Act to provide for an annual return of rates, taxes, tolls, and dues levied for local purposes in England," and any Act amending the same, shall apply to all fees taken in respect of the official business of any clerk, for which a table of fees can be made under this Act, in like manner in all respects as if such fees were dues therein mentioned, and such clerk or the treasurer to any rate or fund to which the fees taken in respect of the official business of such clerk are payable shall make a return thereof accordingly. Application of 23 & 24 Vict. c. 51. to fees and return by clerk.

Every such clerk shall also make any return which a Secretary of State may from time to time require with reference to the duties of the office of such clerk, or matters coming within the cognizance of such clerk by reason of his official business, in such form and with such particulars as the Secretary of State may require; and if he fail to make such return shall be liable to the like penalty as if he had failed to make a return under the said Act.

Miscellaneous.

17. A conviction of any person for an indictable offence in relation to property upon a prosecution instituted or conducted by a public prosecutor shall have the same effect for entitling the owner of the property, or his representative, to obtain restitution or restoration of the property as a conviction upon an indictment preferred by or on behalf of the owner or his representative. Provision as to restitution of stolen property.

Provided that the court before whom the indictment is tried, if satisfied that the owner or his representative has made default in giving all reasonable information and assistance in relation to the prosecution, may, at their discretion, refuse to award any writ or to make any order for restitution, and may at their discretion grant to

A.D. 1872. the public prosecutor or to any other person a certificate of such default, in such form as they may think fit, upon production whereof or upon proof of the granting whereof any action, suit, or proceeding by or on behalf of the person so certified to be in default, which would not be maintainable otherwise than by reason of a conviction upon an indictment preferred by or on behalf of such person shall be stayed.

Extension of
2 & 3 Vict.
c. 71. ss. 29
and 40.

18. Sections twenty-nine and forty of the Act of the session of the second and third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter seventy-one, intituled "An Act for regulating the Police Courts in the Metropolis," (which sections relate to the delivery of possession of goods charged to have been stolen or fraudulently obtained, and to the delivery of goods unlawfully detained, to the owner,) shall apply to the whole of England, in like manner as if they were enacted in this Act, with the omission of all reference to the metropolitan police district, and with the substitution of two justices or a stipendiary magistrate for a justice or magistrate.

Savings for
Attorney
General and
officers.

19. Nothing in this Act—

(1.) Shall affect any right of Her Majesty's Attorney General or Solicitor General, or of any public department or the solicitor thereof, to institute or conduct any prosecution or proceeding; or any right of Her Majesty's Attorney General or any person by his leave to enter or cause to be entered a *nolle prosequi*; or

(2.) Shall, save as prescribed by any regulations made under this Act, exempt any clerk of assize, clerk of the peace, clerk of the Crown, clerk of indictments, constable, officer of police, or other officer from any duty which he may, at the passing of this Act, be liable to perform.

And every clerk of assize and clerk of the peace shall give such aid, in taxing or regulating the costs of a public prosecutor incurred in pursuance of this Act, or the costs payable under the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act, as a Secretary of State may from time to time prescribe.

Every officer of police shall give such aid and information to a public prosecutor as the said public prosecutor, subject to any regulations under this Act, may from time to time require for the purpose of the execution of his duties under this Act.

Commence-
ment of
operation of
Act.

20. This Act shall not, except so far as is necessary for taking proceedings for adopting the same, come into operation in any county or borough until it has been adopted by the local authority of such county or borough.

This Act may be adopted by the local authority of a county or borough by a resolution duly passed by such local authority, by a majority of those who are present at a meeting of such authority, and signed by the chairman of such meeting, and transmitted to the Secretary of State, and upon such transmission shall come into operation at the date thereof.

Application
of Act to
Central
Criminal
Court
District.

21. In the Central Criminal Court District, that is to say, in the district which by the Act of the session of the fourth and fifth years of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter thirty-six, intituled "An Act for establishing a new court for the trial of offences committed in the metropolis and parts adjoining," is deemed to be one county for the purposes mentioned in that Act, this Act shall come into operation on the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, and shall apply in such district in like manner in all respects as if it were a county, subject to the following qualifications:

(1.) A Secretary of State may as soon as conveniently may be after this Act comes into operation therein, and afterwards from time to time, appoint a public prosecutor or public prosecutors for such district without any recommendation:

(2.) Where a county is situate partly within and partly without the Central Criminal Court District, the provisions of this Act which relate to the payment of any clerk by salary, and to the fixing of the table of fees to be taken by any clerk, shall not come into operation in that part of such district which is comprised in such county until this Act has been adopted by the local authority of such county.

Meaning of
"committed
for trial."

22. Where a reference is made in this Act to a person committed for trial, such reference shall be deemed to refer also to a person who has given bail to appear and take his trial, or to answer to an indictment, or is ordered to be detained in custody until removed for the purpose of his trial, and also, unless the context otherwise require, to a person who has been committed, bailed, or ordered to be detained in consequence of an inquisition before a coroner.

For the purposes of this Act, an offence shall be deemed to have been committed in any place in which the venue is or can be laid. A.D. 1872.

23. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms have the meanings herein-after respectively assigned to them; that is to say, Interpretation.

The term "Secretary of State" means one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State:

The term "the Treasury" means the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury:

The term "borough" means any place for the time being subject to the Act of the session of the fifth and sixth years of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter seventy-six, intituled "An Act to provide for the regulation of municipal corporations in England and Wales," and the Acts amending the same, which has a separate court of quarter sessions:

The term "county" does not include a county of a city or a county of a town, but every riding, parts, or division of a county having a separate commission of the peace and separate court of quarter sessions is for the purposes of this Act to be deemed to be a county:

The Isle of Ely, the soke of Peterborough, and the liberty of Saint Alban's are for the purposes of this Act to be deemed to be separate counties; but every other liberty, town, precinct, or place that is not included within the limits of a county or borough as herein-before defined is to be deemed to be annexed to and form part of the county by which it is surrounded, or, if it is partly surrounded by two or more counties, then to be annexed to and form part of that county with which it has the longest common boundary:

The term "local authority" means in relation to a county the justices of such county in general or quarter sessions assembled, and in relation to a borough the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of such borough acting by the council:

The term "Criminal Justice Act, 1851," means the Act of the session of the fourteenth and fifteenth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter fifty-five, intituled "An Act to amend the law relating to the expenses of prosecutions, and to make further provision for the apprehension and trial of offenders in certain cases:"

The term "official business" used in relation to any clerk means any business which such clerk, by reason of his office, performs, or may be called on to perform, whether in pursuance of any Act passed before or after the passing of this Act, or otherwise:

The term "fee" includes any payment or gratuity.

24. Upon this Act coming into operation in any county or borough the Acts specified in the Third Schedule to this Act to the extent specified in the third column of that schedule, and every other enactment fixing or authorising the fixing of fees or a table of fees to be taken by any clerk to whom section nine of the Criminal Justices Act, 1851, applies, shall be repealed so far as they apply to such county or borough. Repeal of Acts in Third Schedule.

Provided that—

(1.) Any fees authorised by any enactment hereby repealed, or any table made thereunder, to be taken by any such clerk, may, until a table of fees made under this Act comes into force with respect to such clerk, continue to be taken as if authorised by a table made under this Act; and

(2.) This repeal shall not affect—

(a.) The payment or recovery of the costs of any prosecution conducted before the appointment of a public prosecutor in such county or borough; or,

(b.) Any penalty, forfeiture, or punishment incurred in respect of any offence committed against any enactment hereby repealed; or,

(c.) Any investigation, legal proceeding, or remedy in respect of any such fees as are authorised by this section to continue to be taken, or of any such penalty, forfeiture, or punishment as aforesaid; and any such investigation, legal proceeding, and remedy may be carried on as if this Act had not passed.

A.D. 1872.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

OFFENCES.

- Any felony } 7 Geo. 4. c. 64. ss. 22, 3.
 Attempt to commit any felony }
 Conspiring to charge any person with any felony or to indict any }
 person of any felony } 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. s. 2.
 Conspiring to commit any felony }
 Riot }
 Neglect or breach of duty as a peace officer } 7 Geo. 4. c. 64. ss. 22, 3.
 Wilful and indecent exposure of the person }
 Wilful and corrupt perjury or subornation of perjury }
 Assaulting or offering violence to any person authorised by 14 & 15 Vict. c. 19. to apprehend any one, or to any person acting in his aid and assistance.
 Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-six, intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to larceny and other similar offences."
 Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-seven, intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to malicious injuries to property."
 Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-eight, intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to indictable offences by forgery."
 Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-nine, intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the statute law of the United Kingdom against offences relating to the coin."
 Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter one hundred, intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to offences against the person."
 Any misdemeanor the expenses of the prosecution on indictment of any person for which are directed by any Act to be paid as in cases of felony.

SCHEDULE TWO.

Session and Chapter.	Title or Abbreviated Title.	Extent of Repeal.
10 & 11 Vict. c. 82.	An Act for the more speedy trial and punishment of juvenile offenders.	Section fourteen.
13 & 14 Vict. c. 37.	An Act for the further extension of summary jurisdiction in cases of larceny.	Section one.
18 & 19 Vict. c. 126.	An Act for diminishing expense and delay in the administration of criminal justice in certain cases.	Section fourteen.
31 & 32 Vict. c. 116.	An Act to amend the law relating to larceny and embezzlement.	Section two.

SCHEDULE THREE.

A.D. 1872.

Note.—This schedule, so far as respects Acts prior to the tenth year of the reign of George the Third, refers to the edition prepared under the direction of the Lord Chancellor, intituled “The Statutes Revised Edition.”

A description or citation of a portion of an Act is inclusive of the words, section, or other part first or last mentioned, or otherwise referred to as forming the beginning or as forming the end of the portion comprised in the description or citation.

Portions of Acts which have already been specifically repealed, are in some instances included in the repeal in this schedule, in order to preclude henceforth the necessity of looking back to previous Acts.

Session and Chapter.	Title or Abbreviated Title.	Extent of Repeal.
26 Geo. 2. c. 14.	- An Act for the settling and ascertaining the fees to be taken by clerks to Justices of the Peace.	The whole Act.
27 Geo. 2. c. 16.	- <i>An Act the title of which begins with the words “An Act for making perpetual several laws,” and ends with the words “from riding upon such carriages.”</i>	Section four.
51 Geo. 3. c. 100.	- An Act to amend an Act passed in the thirty-eighth year of His present Majesty’s reign, intituled “An Act to regulate the trial of causes, “indictments, and other proceedings which arise within the “counties of certain cities and towns corporate within this “kingdom.”	So much of section two as relates to the payment of costs out of any local rate.
57 Geo. 3. c. 91.	- An Act to enable Justices of the Peace to settle the fees to be taken by the Clerks of the Peace of the respective counties and other divisions of England and Wales.	The whole Act.
60 Geo. 3. and 1 Geo. 4. c. 14.	- An Act to remedy certain inconveniences in local and exclusive jurisdictions.	So much of section three as relates to the payment of costs out of any local rate.
7 Geo. 4. c. 64.	- An Act for improving the administration of criminal justice in England.	Sections twenty-two to twenty-seven, except so far as the same are applied to costs and expenses of prosecutions not conducted by public prosecutors.
4 & 5 Will. 4. c. 36.	- An Act for establishing a new court for the trial of offences committed in the metropolis and parts adjoining.	Section twelve.
5 & 6 Will. 4. c. 76.	- An Act to provide for the regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales.	Section one hundred and thirteen, except so far as it is applied to costs of prosecutions not conducted by public prosecutors, and sections one hundred and twenty-four and one hundred and twenty-five, so far as they relate to a table of fees to be taken by a clerk to whom this Act applies.
2 & 3 Vict. c. 15.	- An Act to provide for the more effectual execution of the office of a Justice of the Peace within and adjoining to the district called the Staffordshire Potteries, and for purposes connected therewith.	Section nine, down to “justice acting in pursuance of that Act and.”
2 & 3 Vict. c. 71.	- An Act for regulating the Police Courts in the Metropolis.	Section forty-three, down to “conspicuous part of each of the said courts and.”
2 & 3 Vict. c. 82.	- An Act for the better administration of Justice in detached parts of counties.	Section

A.D. 1872.

Session and Chapter.	Title or Abbreviated Title.	Extent of Repeal.
5 & 6 Vict. c. 109. -	An Act for the appointment and payment of parish constables.	So much of section seventeen as relates to the settling of tables of fees and allowances to any clerk to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies.
6 & 7 Vict. c. 68. -	An Act for regulating theatres -	Section six.
7 & 8 Vict. c. 2. -	An Act for the more speedy trial of offences committed on the high seas.	Section one.
9 & 10 Vict. c. 65. -	An Act to provide for the more effectual execution of the office of a Justice of the Peace, and the better administration of the Police within the borough of Wolverhampton, and certain parishes and places in the neighbourhood thereof, all in the county of Stafford.	Section nine.
11 & 12 Vict. c. 43. -	An Act to facilitate the performance of the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions within England and Wales, with respect to summary convictions and orders.	Section thirty.
14 & 15 Vict. c. 19. -	An Act for the better prevention of offences.	Section fourteen.
14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. -	An Act to amend the law relating to the expenses of prosecutions, and to make further provision for the apprehension and trial of offenders in certain cases.	Sections two and three, and the following words in section nine, namely, "or that " all or any of such clerks for the time " being paid by salaries be paid by fees " in lieu of salary," and also "or to " direct that any such clerk for the time " being paid by salary be paid by fees in " lieu of salary."
16 & 17 Vict. c. 107. -	The Customs Consolidation Act, 1853	Section two hundred and ninety-two, and the table of fees therein referred to.
20 & 21 Vict. c. 43. -	An Act to improve the administration of the law so far as respects summary proceedings before Justices of the Peace.	So much of section three as relates to the ascertaining, appointing, and regulating the fees payable to any clerk to whom this Act applies; and Schedule A.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. -	The Larceny Act, 1861 - -	Section one hundred and twenty.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 97. -	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to malicious injuries to property.	Section seventy-seven.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 98. -	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to indictable offences by forgery.	Section fifty-four.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 100. -	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to offences against the person.	Section seventy-seven.
30 & 31 Vict. c. 35. -	An Act to remove some defects in the administration of the criminal law.	Section five, except so far as relates to cases where the court has no power to order the costs of prosecutions.

CIRCULAR addressed to HER MAJESTY'S JUDGES, CLERKS of the PEACE for COUNTIES,
and RECORDERS of LARGE BOROUGHES.

SIR, Whitehall,
16th September 1872.

I AM directed by Mr. Secretary to transmit to you the enclosed copies of a Bill for the appointment of Public Prosecutors.

Although introduced into the House of Commons by private members, whose names appear on the back of the Bill, it was subsequently recast by the Government, and in its present form had their approval.

It being Mr. intention to introduce a measure on the subject in the next Session of Parliament, he will be obliged if you will cause copies of the Bill to be forwarded to such of the magistrates as are known to take an active part in attending Quarter Sessions, with a request that they will at their convenience favour Mr. , through you, but not later than the end of the year, with their opinion on the present Bill, together with any suggestions which they may desire to offer thereon.

I am,

Your obedient Servant,

——*

From BARON BRAMWELL.

SIR, Four Elms, Edenbridge, Kent,
12th October 1872.

I HAVE read the Public Prosecutors Bill, and submit the following remarks to you, not pretending to any special qualification for giving an opinion on the matter, but complying with your request, as I do with great pleasure, to the best of my ability.

1. I am satisfied there should be public prosecutors other than or in addition to those who at present in many cases perform that sort of duty—I mean the police and magistrates' clerks. One thing alone would show the necessity for such an officer. At the last assizes I had repeatedly cases of great importance, with no counsel instructed for the prosecution; it not being worth the while of the magistrate's clerk to attend the assizes, prepare a brief and pay the fee, and the police having, I suppose, no power to do so. I could mention other reasons if required.

2. I think the function of public prosecutor ought to be exercised or exerciseable before commitment. It seems (section 3) that the Bill contemplates the duty commencing after commitment, though section 4 seems to the contrary. I do not understand that section as compared with section 3. At present, as I have said, the police act as public prosecutors up to commitment, and I must say do the duty very well. But I think it would be desirable that there should be a prosecutor with a knowledge of law, or a person to whom they might apply for advice and assistance. Whether the police would be as zealous if they had to work under a public prosecutor may be a question. I should think they would. Perhaps it would be a good medium course that the magistrate before whom a case comes should, on remanding it, have power to direct the interference of the public prosecutor, and also that the Secretary of State should have power to order the public prosecutor of any district to commence

or proceed with any matter, or perhaps it will be better that the Bill should go no further than it does at present.

3. I think the public prosecutor should be for a district, independently of it being county or borough. For instance, it might be convenient to join the City of London and Southwark. Section 3 speaks of "district," but that means, I suppose, part of a county or borough. See section 7.

4. Section 3, lines 11 and 12, ought to have the word "district" added, and read "county, borough, or district." The same addition should be made in other parts of the Bill.

5. At the end of section 3 a general power should be given to the Secretary of State to direct the public prosecutor to prosecute in any matter he thought fit, though not in the schedule. It might be necessary to provide for extra pay to the public prosecutor; but it would enable a local officer to do what is now done by the solicitors to the Treasury and other public offices.

6. I do not understand what section 4, clause 2, beginning at line 16, means.

7. Section 5 seems ill drawn; in "no county, &c. in which this Act is in operation shall any person be bound," &c. seems better.

8. In this section (5) provision should be made for the vacancy of the office of public prosecutor, so that either a temporary officer or the next adjoining should prosecute, or some one be bound over.

9. In proviso 1 insert words showing that the conditions may be of general application, or *pro hac vice*.

10. No penalty is provided for breach of duty by public prosecutor as prescribed by section 5, page 3, line 14. A criminal information or indictment might be in certain cases. Perhaps loss of office would be enough.

11. Power ought to be given to withdraw from prosecution by leave of court before whom cause is tried or *to be tried*, so as to include the case where there is a wrong committal, and to save the trouble and expense of bringing witnesses, having a bill found, and harassing the accused.

12. Section 6, page 4, line 5, "paid by salary." Is it intended to exclude all such clerks who are paid by fees, and why, if so?

13. Section 7. Who is the local authority of the district? What is the meaning of "expected" to act?

14. I respectfully protest against this giving of the appointment to the local authority. Is it supposed the Crown would have too much patronage? I humbly venture to think we are going fast enough on the democratic track, though perhaps Crown patronage is ministerial, and that is parliamentary, and that is—mischievous. I venture to think this is a bad precedent. Town councils will be claiming to appoint other officers.

15. Section . The appointment of deputy should be subject to approval of Secretary of State, and be for a time to be fixed.

16. Section 9. "Quasi criminal" is a bad expression; "criminal in formo."

17. I suppose the salaries to different prosecutors are to be, or may, vary. I doubt if the words of section 10 are sufficient for this.

18. Is the public prosecutor's bill to be taxed, and by whom?

19. The conclusion of section 11 seems a repetition of part of section 10.

20. Section 12. Witnesses appearing for prosecution, though not on subpoena or recognizance, ought to be paid, if necessary. All the witnesses for the prosecution, though bound to appear or subpoenaed, ought not necessarily to be paid. Such is not the law at present. It gives rise to great abuse. Give the public prosecutor a discretion.

21. Section 17 is all wrong. In the first place, the enactment has nothing to do with a public prosecutor, except perhaps as the private prosecutor is disabled from prosecuting. But the law is not as supposed. Stolen property may be recovered though there is no prosecutor. In the next place, why should the thief or his grantee have the benefit of the theft. Further, the punishment to the person withholding the information may be wholly disproportioned to his offence, which may be small, and the property large, or *vice versa*. The proviso should be omitted.

22. Section 20. I think this wrong. I think the Act should come into operation when the Secretary of State thinks fit to appoint a public prosecutor. He should determine when one ought to be appointed in any district.

23. I think there should be a provision that no action for malicious prosecution should lie against a public prosecutor, or at least not without the leave of the judge or magistrate before whom the case had been. Of course where there is a *malicious*

prosecution it would be well the prosecutor should be made to pay damages, but the mischief is, that actions would be brought for malicious prosecution where there was no malice, and would succeed too; for in these actions it is very difficult to get a jury to find for the defendant, where the plaintiff is innocent and put to expense, and yet has been prosecuted, and there is generally some scrap of evidence, true or false, which makes it necessary to leave the case to the jury.

If it is supposed that I can be of any service to you in this matter pray let me know, and I will do my best.

I am, &c.

G. BRAMWELL.

From MR. JUSTICE LUSH.

SIR, 60, Avenue Road, 31st December 1872.

In compliance with your request, I beg to offer a few suggestions on the Public Prosecutors Bill, as amended in Committee.

I see no objection to the scheme of the Bill. Its structure seems to me to require a few alterations, which I have marked in the margin.

Section 5, sub-section 2, leaves, I think, too much power in the hands of private persons. As the clause is framed, an individual may prefer an indictment without the sanction, or even against the will, of the public prosecutor, or he may anticipate the action of the latter, and run a race with him in the institution of proceedings within his range of duty. I think that the public prosecutor should be alone entitled to prosecute, and alone responsible for the prosecution of all cases within his jurisdiction, except when the individual chooses to enter into a recognizance under the Vexatious Indictments Act, or where he is, under the subsequent clause of this section, authorised by the court or a judge to stand in the place of the public prosecutor.

Clause 7. I have sketched an alteration of language, not to vary the sense, but to get rid of the clumsy paragraph below lines 36 to 40.

Clause 11. Lines 11 and 12 read by themselves are too restrictive. Many criminals are triable and tried where they are apprehended. It is true that the 23rd section expresses these words so as to cover such cases, but the words are unnecessary in this clause, and it is not desirable to use words which require an artificial meaning where they can be dispensed with.

Clause 12 requires some qualification. Under the 30 & 31 Vict. c. 34. s. 5. the court has a discretion to allow or refuse the expenses of witnesses bound over for the prisoner, and the practice is, to refuse the expenses of those whom the jury have disbelieved—such as witnesses to set up a false alibi. The clause, as it stands, seems to give them a right in all cases to be paid. I think it very desirable to retain a check upon this class of witnesses.

First Schedule. The reference to the Statutes is out of place. They have nothing to do with the classification of crimes.

I am anxious to suggest for your consideration an alteration in the jurisdiction of coroners, as regards their power to commit for *trial*, which, if you approve, may not be out of place in this Bill. I would substitute for this power the power to *arrest*, in order to an inquiry in the ordinary way before justices.

As an indictment, a coroner's inquisition is practically of no value. It is never relied on, but a bill is always presented to the grand jury. If the bill is found, the trial takes place on that, and, as a matter of form, the prisoner is arraigned on the coroner's inquisition also. If the bill is ignored it is the practice not to offer any evidence on the inquisition.

In some counties the person committed by the coroner is taken before a justice in the usual way; in others not. In either case, and although the justices have refused to commit, the witnesses have to attend at the assizes and go before the grand jury. I had such a case at the last Manchester assizes. The justices properly discharged the prisoner; there was no shadow of foundation for the finding of the coroner's jury, and I had to instruct the grand jury to throw out the bill. Thus a coroner's inquisition frequently causes expense and inconvenience, and never, in my experience, does any good. When the person committed by the coroner is not charged before a justice, the death of a witness may leave a fatal gap in the evidence; for a deposition taken before a coroner is not, I think, admissible. This very case occurred also at the last Manchester assizes, and after considering the authorities I came to the conclusion

that the deposition of a deceased witness, taken before the coroner, could not be read ; and for want of the item of proof which that would have supplied the prisoner was acquitted. I think that if the coroner had the power, and was obliged to send every person found guilty by his jury before a justice to be charged in the ordinary way, with the offence found, every good purpose of the inquiry would be answered, and much expense and inconvenience be prevented.

I am, &c.

ROBERT LUSH.

SUGGESTIONS MADE BY MR. JUSTICE LUSH.

SECTION 5.

Sub-section 2.

- (2.) Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person of any right of instituting or conducting any proceeding before justices, *which it is not the duty of the public prosecutor to institute or conduct*, ~~or of preferring an indictment against any alleged offender who has not been committed for trial~~, or of the right to be bound over to prosecute any alleged offender who is not committed for trial, or of preferring any indictment or conducting any prosecution for an offence which is not mentioned in the First Schedule to this Act, ~~or which a public prosecutor does not in fact prefer or conduct.~~

SECTION 7.

7. ~~The Secretary of State shall notify to the local authority of every county or borough every vacancy in the office of public prosecutor for such county or borough, and where there is more than one public prosecutor for such county or borough, the district in which such public prosecutor will be expected to act, and upon the adoption of this Act by the local authority of any county or borough, whenever thereafter a vacancy shall arise in the office of public prosecutor for such county or borough, such vacancy to be notified to the local authority by the Secretary of State, a recommendation of not less than three persons fit to be appointed to fill such vacancy may, from time to time, be made to the Secretary of State by the such local authority of such county or borough, so, however, that regard be had to the district in which such public prosecutor will be required to act, and that in the case of a borough the recommendation be made with the consent of a majority of the justices of the borough present at a special sessions.~~

* * * * *

~~Upon this Act first coming into operation in any county or borough each appointment to be made for such county or borough shall be deemed to constitute a vacancy within the meaning of this section.~~

SECTION 9.

9. * * * * * If any public prosecutor act in contravention of or fail to comply with this section he shall be liable on summary conviction before two justices to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, and shall be disqualified for a term of not less than five years ~~for~~ from acting as public prosecutor.

SECTION 11.

Paragraph 3.

After a public prosecutor has been appointed in any county or borough in pursuance of this Act, the certificate of the costs payable under the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act to any prosecutor or witnesses, ~~in the case of any offence committed in such county or borough~~, shall be transmitted to such persons and in such manner as may be prescribed by regulations made under this Act, and the amount of such costs when ascertained in manner prescribed by the said regulations shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament, and not out of any county or other local rate.

SECTION 12.

12. The public prosecutor shall, as soon as practicable after the trial of any person prosecuted by him, pay to witnesses (including witnesses for the accused) *whose expenses have been allowed by the court* (30 & 31 Vict. c. 34., s. 5.) ~~who appear on recognizance or subpoena to give evidence at such trial~~ their expenses incurred in such attendance and in attending before the examining justices and the grand jury, and compen-

sation for their trouble and loss of time therein, and shall pay to the prosecutor (if any) of such person before the justices the expenses incurred by such prosecutor therein, and compensation for his trouble and loss of time therein, and shall make such payments in accordance with the regulations for the time being in force in relation thereto under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, &c.

From MR. JUSTICE MELLOR.

SIR,

I HAVE considered as requested the proposed Bill for establishing public prosecutors, and I venture to submit the following observations.

I think the scheme proposed is very defective in not establishing an earlier and more direct system of communication between the police and the proposed public prosecutor.

In my opinion the utility of public prosecutors will much depend upon their giving advice and direction to the police in the investigation of the circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime in the earlier stage before a charge is preferred before a magistrate.

At present the clerks to the magistrates discharge most of the duties proposed to be cast upon public prosecutors, and I confess that I do not see in the provisions of the Bill any guarantee that the proposed public prosecutors shall be more competent to discharge the duties prescribed than are magistrates' clerks.

Magistrates' clerks do not take up a prosecution or advise the police until the charge is made before the justices, and I confess I have always thought that the want of a person competent to advise and direct the police in the earlier stages was a serious defect in our system.

At present I find nothing but a substitution of persons selected by the Secretary of State, upon the recommendation of the local authority, for clerks at present selected by the justices, without sufficient provision that they shall be better qualified; and if the restrictions in section 9 (the value of which I do not see) are maintained, increased expense must be the consequence.

I think that the public prosecutors proposed by the Bill should be placed under the control and general superintendence of a superior officer, who should be responsible to the Secretary of State, or to the Attorney General, and should be competent to advise and direct the proposed public prosecutors in all matters of serious difficulty and importance, and who should have authority to direct the public prosecutors to take any particular course that he may think necessary, and who should have power to control the employment of counsel so as to prevent favoritism, and to secure efficiency in the conduct of the case at assizes and sessions.

I think that whatever system is adopted should be compulsory and uniform throughout the country.

I think that the public prosecutor should be able to issue a summons to compel the attendance of any witness whose presence he may think desirable before the magistrates at any stage of the investigation, and to certify the reasonable expenses of such witnesses as expenses incidental to the prosecution.

My fear is that the provisions of this Bill will not provide for competent assistance and direction to the police in the outset and conduct of the early investigation of the circumstances surrounding any crime.

Secondly, I do not see any security for the appointment of a better class of men than at present fill the office of magistrates' clerks, and I think that under new names but at greater expense the conduct of prosecutions will very generally fall into the hands of persons of the same kind as at present.

I think that the provision in section 5 for changing the conduct of the prosecution from the public prosecutors to other persons will be found in practice too cumbrous to be acted upon, and I think the change should be made in a summary manner by the Attorney or Solicitor General, or the Secretary of State.

These are some of the objections which strike me upon reading the Bill. There are many matters in the criminal procedure which might be amended, but they scarcely fall within the scope of this Bill.

I have, &c.

JNO. MELLOR.

From MR. BARON CLEASBY, 4, Park Street, Westminster, 1st February 1873.

SIR, I HOPE I shall be excused for not having sooner answered your letter asking for any remarks I had to make upon the Public Prosecutors Bill as amended in committee.

I can give in a few words the results of my experience.

First.—I think in the great majority of felony cases, indeed in all cases with few exceptions, a public prosecutor would be of no use. In very many cases either the prisoner pleads guilty, or the case is clear, and proved by few witnesses, and no care is required in getting up the case. I should, therefore, suggest that the public prosecutor should only act in those cases in which a magistrate before whom a case was brought, or to whom an application was made for the purpose, should direct the matter to be placed in his hands; otherwise a great and unnecessary expense would be incurred and an inappropriate machinery introduced.

Secondly.—The result of my experience is, that in general there is no want of energy or ability in the manner in which prosecutions are got up and managed by the police. The fault has been in the police taking to the case with too much anxiety to convict, and the consequence has been that the accused has not always been fairly dealt with. I have known many cases in which a quarrel and fight in the streets has been made the subject of a charge for highway robbery, and also many in which an indecent assault by lads has been the subject of a charge for rape, and there has been much exaggeration in the evidence. This over-anxiety may be illustrated by Dr. Hessell's case. But I do not see how the public prosecutor could deal with this mischief, or dispense with the police in proving and influencing the evidence. The police would be more influenced by being impressed by the magistrate and the judges with the duty of dealing with every case fairly, and not because they are interested in a case, making it a point to carry it through, and so achieve a success.

If what I had to say would lead to real and extensive alterations in the Bill, it would have been only right that I should have furnished you with my remarks before, but what I have said is not of that nature, and affects the whole measure, I may be excused.

I am, &c.

A. CLEASBY.

From MR. WELLER.

SIR, Tenterden, 19th September 1872.

PERMIT me to suggest the addition of the following or similar words to the paragraph of clause 23 (interpretation clause), relating to the meaning of the word "borough" in the Public Prosecutors Bill—

"or in which a court of *general* session is held under the Act passed in the 6th and 7th years of the reign of King William the 4th, c. 105."

There are some boroughs which have not a separate court of *quarter* sessions, but which hold *general* sessions of the peace under section 10 of the above Act. Tenterden is one of them.

I am, &c.

STEPHEN WELLER,

Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. LATHAM, J.P.

SIR, Bradwell Hall, Sandbach, 10th October 1872.

I HAVE carefully read the Bill (as amended in committee) for the appointment of public prosecutors, &c., which was forwarded to me by the clerk of the peace for this county. As a mere temporary measure it seems to me fairly enough drawn, but I am convinced that to satisfy the public requirements something of a much larger nature is required. The result, it seems to me, of the 6th and 7th sections will be, practically, that the clerk to the magistrates will be the public prosecutor for the division in which he acts. My observations apply only to the rural and semi-rural districts, for I have no special knowledge of the boroughs and large towns. The

areas will be settled by the Secretary of State after consultation with the court of quarter sessions, and the only difficulty I foresee is that in many districts there will not be three qualified persons from whom the Secretary of State may make a choice.

But if I had to select one person more unfit than another to be a public prosecutor I should say that an attorney in practice within the district was the man. As far as small cases of felony or misdemeanor go, no doubt he would do the work, indeed he does it now, for there can be no doubt that the police seldom put the law in motion, and a private individual never does without consultation with the magistrate's clerk; but in cases where a public prosecutor is required principally—cases where there is fraud suspected, and which wants an independent person to expose the fraud—I believe an attorney who practices in the neighbourhood would be worse than useless. He would often know too much, more frequently have had professional knowledge of and dealings with the suspected person, and his action would frequently be ascribed to spite. If a public prosecutor is to be of any use I hold that he must occupy an independent position, that he should not practice privately, and, with the exception of his residence, that he should not be connected with the neighbourhood. For the mere delivery of briefs, the arrangement of costs, the preparation of evidence, a clerk to the magistrate might answer well enough. He does under a different title the same work now, but for all the higher duties I hold him utterly incompetent. I can now call to mind several frauds which ought to have been brought to justice, and which the very men whom it is now proposed to make public prosecutors have, as private solicitors, hushed up and compromised.

My view, therefore, of a public prosecutor is, that his duties should extend over a considerable area, that he should do nothing but those duties, that he should be well acquainted with law, and be in every way independent. Of course, to get such a man we must be prepared to pay him adequately to insure efficiency and independence. And here comes the difficulty; he must be paid either from the Consolidated Fund or the rates, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the one hand, and the ratepayers on the other, will be equally disinclined to create offices which will require some 100,000*l.* per annum to pay them. But I think the difficulty might be solved by the employment of the coroner as public prosecutor. At present I believe such an officer to be utterly useless. In some cases he is obliged to sit when there is not the least legal or moral doubt what the verdict must be. An old woman drops down dead, or a child tumbles into a pond, and without suspicion in either case, the whole form of an inquest has to be gone through. In other cases of murder the police really get up the whole evidence, and after a verdict has been given the prisoner is tried, not on the coroner's inquisition, but on the indictment found by the grand jury after committal by the magistrates. There is certainly one class of cases,—accidents by railways, collieries, boilers, &c.—in which a coroner's inquest brings out a mass of evidence; but these are, it strikes me, exactly the cases in which a public prosecutor would be useful. The verdict of two juries is unnecessary, especially when the first jury is composed of neighbours and locally prejudicial men. I consider, therefore, that in the present state of society the office of coroner is useless in some cases, and superfluous in others. The inquest gives pain to relations, and the evidence is often gossippy and scandalous. But if in the present areas over which a coroner's duties extend a public prosecutor were appointed, with power to hold inquiries and hear evidence in all cases where he might think it worth while to do so, to give certificate of burial when he was convinced there was no crime, and besides, to do what the public prosecutor has to do by the proposed Bill, *i.e.*, to prepare cases and investigate evidence, I believe much good would be done. To put it simply, let the coroner hold an inquisition in all cases of crime, and let him have the power to decide whether it is necessary to hold the inquisition or not. The county rates are taxed heavily for the support of this officer. In this county we pay some 2,000*l.* per annum for salaries and expenses, including the 1*s.* per head fee to the jurors, and the payment of witnesses. I may safely say that no 2,000*l.* a year is more uselessly spent. Most probably nine-tenths of the money need never be spent at all, and in the one-tenth left the work is done over again before the magistrates. But it may be asked are the coroners fit to do work, and I say without hesitation they are in many cases not. The officer has been got by an election, until lately, among a class of very ignorant voters, and I fear that frequently a very improper class of men, both in standing and professional knowledge, now holds the office. Still the saving of the expenses alone would go a long way to pay the salaries of better men, and a good many coroners would be willing to retire from a disagreeable duty for a moderate compensation. The areas being large there would

be a choice of good men from whom the Secretary of State might make his selection, and what would, in my opinion, be a great advantage,—the office would not be held by an attorney practising in a borough for that borough, but would be open to a man who has no connexion with the place. I confess that I should be inclined to leave the appointment in the hands of the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench as the most likely way to avoid the suspicion of a political appointment on the one hand, or the jobbery of an election by magistrates at quarter sessions on the other. The third alternative of election by suffrage of freeholders as at present I dismiss at once as ridiculous and hopeless.

Having, therefore, secured the appointment of an independent and capable man to manage criminal matters over a considerable area, and also having suggested a means by which the ratepayers would not be unduly burdened, I come now to the duties of such a man. I think that his business should be rather to watch than to act. I do not see any great advantage in his having personally to get up petty cases for larceny before quarter sessions as long as he takes care that they are properly got up. He ought to be answerable if there was a miscarriage of justice, but I think he might find his own tools to work with. We have in this county at length succeeded in paying clerks to magistrates by salaries and not by fees, but we have been unable to include the costs of prosecutions in these salaries,—in my opinion the part of their business where it is most desirable that there should be no temptation to create business,—because a very heavy case of murder, forgery, or fraud might come in to disturb those calculations on which the salary is fixed. The public prosecutor might come in usefully to decide this question. He might manage what ordinary work the clerks to magistrates should take, and charge himself with the extraordinary work. And, as an old barrister on circuit and sessions, I am disposed to believe that the arrangement would tend to keep up what is most desirable, an adequate Bar at the sessions. Briefs would be given, not as a matter of course, as is done now frequently, by the attorneys in borough courts, all round to the Bar present, but in some measure according to ability. Few men continue to go to borough sessions where they get a brief or two as a matter of routine, and where merit will get them no more after the first few years. I would leave, therefore, the conduct of prosecutions in the hands of magistrates' clerks at a salary, with a general power of superintendence in the hands of the public prosecutor, and a right to take up the case himself if he thinks it of sufficient importance. I would make him the taxing officer for the Treasury, and give him the power of applying to the court, should he think a higher scale of fees, or a larger allowance to witnesses, were necessary. He should keep a record of all previous convictions, and be answerable for such convictions being properly laid in the indictment; and in cases where the presiding judge might consider that perjury or forgery had been shown during a trial the matter should be referred to him for investigation. In short, he should be the local minister of justice, bound to put the law in motion against evil-doers, and equally bound to discourage, and to have power to order to be discontinued, all spiteful and malicious prosecutions. As a rule, I think there should only be one for each county or district having a sessions of its own, but there might in larger counties be deputies appointed, to reside in another part. I believe that a salary of 1,000*l.* or 800*l.* per annum would secure a good man, and the deputies, with a hope of promotion, might be content with half that amount.

I may add that I am inclined to believe that section 20 would make the proposed Act a dead letter in counties. I am not prepared to speak of the Central Criminal Court district, or of towns like Manchester and Liverpool. If there be any virtue in a public prosecutor his employment should be compulsory, and the Act should be confined to the districts where it is especially wanted. The section 20 would seem to apply to the whole Act, and equally to make the payment by salaries still optional as the appointment of a public prosecutor, as the Act does not come into operation until it has been adopted by the local authority.

I hope that the expression of my opinions on the general question, and not simply on the details of the Bill, will not be considered irrelevant and impertinent. I think the subject is one of great public importance, and deserves, if treated at all, to be treated adequately.

I have, &c.

GEORGE W. LATHAM.

From Mr. .

SIR, Carnarvon, 29th October 1872.

THE Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, which accompanied your letter of the 16th September last, was brought under the notice of the magistrates at the quarter sessions held here on the 17th instant, and I am directed by them to inform you that they do not consider its provisions would be attended with advantage in this county.

I have, &c.

Clerk of the Peace for the county of Carnarvon.

From Mr. E. H. LEYCESTER PENRHYN.

SIR, East Sheen, Surrey, S.W.,
2nd November 1872.

IN reply to your circular letter on the subject of the Public Prosecutors Bill, I beg to inform you that the proposed measure has been considered by the magistrates of this county, and I am desired to say that in their opinion the advantages to be derived from the Bill are by no means commensurate with the very heavy expenditure which it will involve, even in its amended form.

In this county nearly 1,000 indictable offences are annually tried, the great majority of which involve no difficulties, and require either attorney nor counsel as prosecutors, but in which the chairman of the courts of quarter sessions are quite competent to try the cases from the depositions sent up from the court below.

In cases in which prisoners are defended by counsel, counsel are retained by the court on behalf of the prosecution, and in most cases are able efficiently to discharge their duty from the depositions with which they are entrusted.

In cases, however, of very complicated character it would be a great improvement if they were furnished with briefs carefully prepared by an attorney.

In lieu therefore of the appointment of public prosecutors to act in all cases committed for trial, however trivial and simple in their character, at a very large and unnecessary cost to the public, we would recommend that the committing magistrates should be authorised, in any case which should appear to them to present features of difficulty either as regards the law or the facts, to direct some attorney to conduct the prosecution and retain counsel.

They might also be empowered to exercise a similar discretion at any earlier stage, either on the application of the police or on their own judgment when remanding the accused.

With this assistance we believe the police to be fully competent to initiate prosecutions before the magistrates below, the more so as it is to them that public prosecutors, if appointed, would have to look for the information as to the committal of crimes, and the evidence on which they rest.

Whilst objecting therefore to this portion of the Act, even in its optional form, we still more strongly dissent from the provisions of the 21st section, making its adoption compulsory in the district of the Central Criminal Court. Within this district, a large portion of which is within the county of Surrey, the excellence of the police, and the tried experience of the police magistrates and their clerks, render the introduction of public prosecutors exceptionally unnecessary, whilst the large number of cases (many of them of the simplest description) committed for trial would entail an expenditure heavy out of all proportion to the benefits which would accrue.

Whilst approving generally of the principles of the Bill as regards the substitution of salaries for fees, we think it most desirable that these two main portions of the Bill should be severed so as to make it possible to adopt the one and reject the other.

I have, &c.

E. H. LEYCESTER PENRHYN,
Chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions, Surrey.

From MR. T. B. ADDISON.

SIR, (I enclose a copy of the Bill.)

Preston, 14th November 1872.

I HAD the honour to receive a copy of the Public Prosecutors Bill (as first printed and since amended) with a request for observations upon it.

The title is rather ambiguous.

The Bill relates more to the functions now discharged by the police and by magistrates' clerks than to those of an Attorney-General, or of counsel representing the Crown.

It might be called a Bill for the better conduct of public prosecutions.

Its object is an important one, but so technical in itself, and so technically treated, that few persons will be found who could anticipate with confidence that its provisions can be practically carried out with advantage, or that can judiciously suggest amendments of them.

I would, however, call attention to a delicate, but important, part of the prosecutor's duties; I mean the instruction of counsel, including the decision what counsel shall be entrusted with the advocacy of each particular case.

This is now done by the attorney engaged, very commonly the magistrate's clerk; and the result is that the business is distributed, more or less equally, among the counsel attending the court.

Such briefs are well known by the title of *soup tickets*.

These opportunities to the younger members of the Bar for displaying their power of managing light business, and improving by practice their qualification for the more difficult, is of great advantage to them, and through them to the public.

A system of centralisation might make this branch of practice a monopoly, and the disposal of it might be governed by personal favour, or exercised for political motives.

It would be well to guard against this inconvenience by some regulation under section 3 (amended Bill), or, as the question is one of delicacy, by some general instruction to the public prosecutors, enjoining impartiality, such instruction to be made known to the Bar in such a way that any palpable abuse would be open to animadversion.

Some discretion would still have to be exercised by the public prosecutor, that cases of any special difficulty should be placed in the hands of advocates known to him as having the greater share of experience and ability.

I have, &c.

T. B. ADDISON,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions at Preston.

From the CLERK OF THE PEACE, Radnor.

Shirehall, Presteign, 19th November 1872.

The Clerk of the Peace for the county of Radnor has enclosed a letter from the Chairman of the Quarter Sessions to the Home Secretary upon the Public Prosecutors Bill.

From MR. R. LISTER VENABLES.

Oxford and Cambridge Club, London,

DEAR SIR, (I enclose a copy of the Bill.) 16th November 1872.

IN COMPLIANCE with a request expressed by Mr. Bruce in a letter to you dated September 19th, 1872, I send to you, to be communicated to the Home Secretary of State, a few observations on the Public Prosecutors Bill transmitted by him.

In the county of Radnor the amount of crime is so exceptionally trivial, and prosecutions are therefore so few, that a public prosecutor is hardly required. Under the general circumstances, however, of the country, I believe the enactments proposed by the Bill would prove highly beneficial. It would place both the justices and the police officers in their proper position, by supplying a remedy for the not unfrequent incapacity of the real prosecutor in obtaining and furnishing evidence and bringing the case into a proper shape. At present this duty is in many cases improperly thrown upon the police. According to section 20 of the Bill the adoption of the Act is optional with the local authority. I should prefer a compulsory Act, giving power to the Secretary of State to suspend its operation for a limited time, on the application of the local authority, if he should under the circumstances think fit to do so. If the Act

were made compulsory I think that twelve months from the date of its passing should be given to the local authority in complying with sections 7, 13, and 14.

I doubt the expediency of section 9, so far as it relates to parliamentary elections. It would be very difficult effectually to enforce the prohibitions, or to know when they were enforced. I think the best men in the profession of an attorney practising in the country would be unwilling to incur those prohibitions, and therefore unwilling to accept the office of public prosecutor.

Sections 10 and 11 will no doubt be very acceptable to the ratepayers of counties, but I hardly understand from what fund the public prosecutor is to make immediate payments (under section 12) to witnesses, &c., who is to tax the costs, or how payments afterwards disallowed are to be refunded.

I remain, &c.

R. LISTER VENABLES,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Radnorshire.

From MR. NICHOLSON.

SIR, Sessions House, Clerkenwell, E.C.,
22nd November 1872.

I BEG to forward you the only opinion I have as yet received on this Bill.

I am, &c.

RICH. W. NICHOLSON,

Clerk of the Peace.

OBSERVATIONS on the BILL for the APPOINTMENT of a PUBLIC PROSECUTOR.

The office of public prosecutor requires qualifications of a superior order beyond ordinary professional competence as regards the criminal law, but also habits of analysis, the power of sifting and marshalling evidence, and of presenting a case in a clear and impartial manner to the jury, and of adequate professional status to meet on equal terms the counsel employed for the defence.

I assume that the public prosecutor would personally conduct prosecutions in court, and be responsible for the management of each case, as well as be competent in status to follow the case to a court of appeal.

In addition to these qualifications I consider it essential that the public prosecutor should be so entirely free from local influences as to ensure confidence in his impartiality and independence.

Entertaining these views, I am of opinion that such grave objections exist to the class of persons, being appointed public prosecutors as contemplated in the Bill, that I think the advantages anticipated from the establishment of a public prosecutor (urgently as such an officer is required) would be greatly, if not entirely, counterbalanced if the proposed class of appointments should be adopted.

It is proposed to limit the appointments to attorneys, or to clerks to the justices, or to local attorneys, none of whom are at present qualified by status to conduct cases in person at assizes or quarter sessions.

Desiring to speak with due respect to a valuable body of practitioners, I yet consider them specially disqualified for such appointments from the local influence which they possess on the one hand, and of the local influence to which they may be subject on the other.

As the confidential advisers of the local justices, it is well known that they exercise great influence on the decisions of their local Benches; they are the ordinary legal advisers of their neighbours; they are generally the active agents of one or other of the political, municipal, or clerical parties from which no district is exempt; and it would therefore, in my opinion, be impossible for them to command the confidence of the district in the same degree as an officer perfectly independent of local bias or influence.

It will not be contended that "local authorities" in counties, and especially in boroughs, are not, as a rule, the result of party contests, and of course the three persons to be recommended by such local authorities to the Secretary of State will be nominated by, and reflect the bias of, the temporary predominant influence of the county or borough.

The appointment of a public prosecutor must be expected to excite considerable opposition; there will be the direct opposition of a powerful and united body of legal

practitioners to such a diversion of criminal business, and who will of course bring their influence to bear of their parliamentary representatives; there will be the "cry" of "patronage" and "centralization," the objections of novelty and experiment, and the indirect opposition of the upholders of "things as they are."

I therefore take leave to suggest the adoption of a system which is not open to the charge of novelty or experiment, but which has been in operation for centuries, and secured the due, efficient, and speedy administration of the criminal law, and relieved private prosecutors from trouble and expense. I allude to the system of administering the criminal law through a public prosecutor in Scotland, where the Lord Advocate is in reality what the Attorney-General is in theory only in respect of prosecutions.

I would propose that the Attorney-General should become the public prosecutor, and that he should either appoint or nominate for appointment a barrister as deputy on each circuit, and that in cities or boroughs the Recorders should nominate one or more qualified persons to the Secretary of State to prosecute at quarter sessions.

When Sir Robert Peel introduced his Bills for the consolidation and amendment of the criminal law he expressed not only his opinion in favour of creating a public prosecutor, but also of adopting the system which has worked so well in Scotland.

The Secretary of State possesses such facilities for obtaining official information as to the operation of the system in Scotland, and its advantages and details from the Lord Advocate and Solicitor-General for Scotland, that it is unnecessary and would be officious to describe it here.

P. NORTHALL LAURIE, J.P.

From MR. HENRY BEAUMONT.

SIR, Grantham, 3rd December 1872.

IN obedience to your letter of the 16th September 1872, I brought this Bill before the magistrates of this borough, and I have now the honour to forward you some suggestions they have made, and which they respectfully submit for your consideration.

I am, &c.

HENRY BEAUMONT,
Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF GRANTHAM.

The magistrates beg respectfully to intimate that they have come to the following conclusions:—

1. That the Act should be made compulsory and not permissive; they think that great inconvenience will arise if the Act be adopted in one place or district and not in another.

2. As to Clause 3.

The magistrates think that the public prosecutor ought to conduct all prosecutions for indictable offences.

That every person intending to charge another with an indictable offence should give notice to the public prosecutor before such person applies for any summons or warrant.

That the public prosecutor should then determine whether he will take up the prosecution at that stage or not.

In case he does not take up the prosecution at that stage, that he should have the option of intervening and taking up the prosecution at any time afterwards.

3. As to Clause 4.

That this clause should provide more explicitly that the public prosecutor should conduct all proceedings incidental to a prosecution, such as the argument of Crown cases reserved, proceedings on a writ of error, and cases removed by certiorari to the Queen's Bench.

That he should have the preparation of all indictments, and that he should have power to enter a *nolle prosequi* at any time by the permission of the Attorney-General, or by the permission of the presiding judge or chairman of any court where indictments are tried.

4. *As to Clause 5.*

The magistrates think that all indictable offences should be included in the Vexatious Indictments Act, 22 & 23 Vict. c. 17.

At the present time any party can go *ex parte* before the grand jury and prefer a charge against anyone for an offence not included in that Act. The grand jury have no means of ascertaining the truth or falsehood of such charge, as they have no means of compelling the attendance of witnesses. In case a bill is found upon such statement the accused can be held to bail or committed to prison (11 & 12 Vict. c. 42, s. 3, and ss. 20, 21).

5. The magistrates wish to draw the attention of the Home Secretary to the fact that at the present time there is no subpoena that can be enforced to compel the attendance of a witness at either quarter sessions or assizes, except the Crown Office subpoena, which is expensive, and for the disobedience to which a person can only be punished in the Queen's Bench or by indictment.

The 11 & 12 Vict. c. 43, s. 7, only applies to proceedings in petty sessions, and therefore at the present time the magistrates have to resort to the clumsy and roundabout expedient of compelling witnesses to enter into recognizances to appear and give evidence. With regard to witnesses found after a prisoner has been committed for trial there is no means at the present time of compelling their attendance, except by the Crown Office subpoena mentioned above.

The magistrates venture to suggest that a simple form of subpoena be provided by statute, and that the same should be issued by the clerk of the peace on the application of either the prosecutor or the accused.

That disobedience without reasonable excuse should be punished by the presiding judge or chairman as a contempt of court.

6. The magistrates would further suggest, as to clause 5, sub-section 2, that any person conducting a prosecution under those circumstances shall be liable to pay the costs of the prosecution and of the defence if the presiding judge shall so order.

7. In clause 6 it is provided that the public prosecutor may be an attorney of three years' standing. The magistrates cannot help thinking that such standing is too little, and that five years would be a better period to fix. They also respectfully suggest that the person appointed should be a person of real experience and position.

8. The magistrates also suggest, in clause 9, that the words "in the district for which he shall be public prosecutor" be inserted after the word "or" in the 16th line of page 5.

9. *As to Clause 12.*

The magistrates think that this clause should provide that if the court order the payment as in that clause mentioned that the public prosecutor should as soon as practicable pay any sum so ordered by the court.

They also think that a prisoner should be furnished with a copy of the depositions and indictment by the public prosecutor, the expense to be included in his certificate of costs.

10. *As to Clause 17.*

The magistrates think that in every case of larceny or obtaining goods by false pretences that the court should have the power to leave to the jury the question of property in addition to the question as to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, so that in case the prisoner is acquitted, if the jury should find that the property is the property of the prosecutor or other person concerned, that the court should thereupon have power to make a simple order in accordance with the finding of the jury, and that all writs of restitution should be abolished.

From MR. SAUNDERS.

DEAR SIR, 1, Priory Place, Bath, 11th December 1872.

ALTHOUGH I have not been requested to express any opinion as to the necessity or policy of the Bill entitled as above, I will nevertheless venture to present my views upon the subject.

The supposed necessity for a public prosecutor is founded in the belief that justice frequently fails from the want of an efficient officer, whose duty it should be to superintend the preliminary steps necessary to effectually bringing an accused person

to trial. I believe that much error exists upon this point, and that whilst there is ample machinery at present existing, if properly utilized, for accomplishing the object contemplated (so far indeed as the establishing of a public prosecutor is concerned), the failure of justice is, in most cases, to be attributed to causes quite independent of the non-action of such an official. To deal with this last assertion first.

I find by the judicial statistics for the year 1870 (I have not those by me for 1871, but the proportions will be about the same) that of 17,578 persons committed for trial the bills against 870 (or nearly five per cent.) were *ignored* by the grand jury. Now, in each of these cases, the witnesses had been fully examined before the committing justices in the presence of the prisoners, who, in many of the cases, probably themselves adduced witnesses in their defence; and there can be no reasonable doubt that each prisoner was properly committed for trial upon a *prima facie* case. It may then be fairly assumed that in the ignoring of the bills against these 870 persons *justice has failed*. How can this be accounted for? By this—between the committal and the presenting of the bills of indictment there have been opportunities for the friends of the prisoners to tamper with the witnesses for the prosecution; and inasmuch as the grand jury know nothing of the evidence previously given by the witnesses before the committing magistrate, and it is morally impossible to indict a witness for perjury committed before a grand jury, there is an effectual opportunity for a witness so to trim and garble his evidence as to present a case to them very different from that which was presented to the court below. In this way alone can it be understood how it so often happens that grand juries ignore bills when the evidence as given before the committing magistrate was of *the most conclusive character*. In truth, the grand jury system is a great obstruction in the way of a due administration of justice, and common sense must declare against the policy of submitting, with less opportunities of forming a correct judgment, a case which has already passed the ordeal of a more efficient investigation before the committing justice. The establishing of a public prosecutor will not cure this defect in our system of criminal procedure; for let the case be as carefully got up as it may be by that functionary, it may still be wholly defeated by the untruthful evidence of the witnesses when before the grand jury. It may be said that this defect may equally manifest itself upon the subsequent trial before the petty jury. But this is incorrect, for the witness knowing that his depositions are before the presiding judge, and that he may be confronted with what he has before deposed to, would hardly venture to depart from his former evidence.

But as regards my assertion, that there is ample machinery at present existing, if properly utilized, for accomplishing the object contemplated (so far indeed as the establishing of a public prosecutor is concerned), the present practice is for the clerk of the committing justices to conduct the prosecution. Now, the justices' clerk is, as a rule, the most reputable practitioner in the neighbourhood, one whose character, position, and reputation are guarantees for the honour of his conduct and the efficiency of his proceedings. It may be expected of him that he will, for his own personal and professional credit, do all that he can, with the means at his command, to conduct with success the prosecution confided to his hands. But most unfortunately the law, as it at present exists, prevents him from using those means which are necessary for a successful prosecution, and he often finds his hands completely tied in the matter. It may transpire that after the party charged with some crime is committed for trial (upon possibly a slight case), there are persons living at a distance whose testimony may throw great light upon the subject, and whom it might be necessary to have an interview with, in order to ascertain the nature and effect of their evidence. A long journey, therefore, might be requisite to see these persons; but who is to bear the expense? There is positively no fund out of which the justices' clerk could be recouped even his travelling expenses, even should the witnesses be in this way procured, and their evidence turn out to be of the greatest importance. The clerk, therefore, if he hears of such testimony, cannot venture upon procuring it, and thus possibly the case may break down for the want of evidence which *did* exist, but which was *not* procured. Thus, again, it may be convenient for the elucidation of the case (especially in those of arson, burglary, highway robbery, &c.) that there should be a *model* of the premises or a *plan* of the neighbourhood. But who is to incur the cost? No one but the justices' clerk can venture upon forming an opinion as to the propriety of having either the one or the other; but with the chance of the costs (often heavy) of having a model or plan prepared not being sanctioned by the judge at the trial, no clerk to the justices

would venture upon incurring such a liability; and in this way again the case may break down.

Now these are the defects of the present system which chiefly lead to the miscarriage of criminal justice. But will they be remedied by the establishment of a public prosecutor? Unquestionably, the evils connected with the grand jury system will not be touched by such an establishment. Witnesses will still be enabled to trim and garble their evidence before the grand jury, and thus assist a culprit in escaping conviction. Nor will the other defects be remedied unless a much greater latitude is allowed the public prosecutor in incurring expenditure, and which, if *now allowed to the clerk of the justices*, would render the appointment of a public prosecutor, and the vast expense of his salary or remuneration, wholly unnecessary.

The entire efficacy of the intended Act of Parliament as regards the appointing of public prosecutors will depend upon the way in which the second sub-section of the third section, together with the 10th section, are carried out; the essence of the latter section depending upon how the Treasury will deal with respect to the words "together with all costs properly incurred by such public prosecutor, in accordance with the regulations under this Act, in the execution of his duties under the Act." Until I see what the regulations are, and what the costs allowed, I can form no opinion upon the subject.

I will now refer to a few clauses individually:—

As regards the 10th section, I think that all the restrictions except those which apply to being concerned as an attorney in any criminal proceeding should be expunged. By retaining the other disqualifications a great number of highly respectable magistrates' clerks will be disqualified from being appointed. A great many of them are at present parliamentary agents, and I am not aware that any prejudice to the administration of criminal justice has arisen therefrom.

According to the sixth section a public prosecutor will be appointed, not for each petty sessional division, but for a considerable district. If it is expected that such public prosecutor is to go about and look after the individual cases in the various localities, no respectable practitioner will undertake such duties unless he is *handsomely* remunerated, especially when it is remembered how severe are the restrictions placed upon him by the 10th section. This remuneration, it will be remembered, will be an entirely new burthen upon the public, and the duties cannot be otherwise than inefficiently performed. The better plan, as it seems to me, is to constitute each clerk of petty sessions the public prosecutor for the petty sessional division, remunerating him properly for his services.

The provisions as to the payment of witnesses, as provided for by the 11th and 12th sections, are exceedingly crude and complex. Is the public prosecutor to pay the amount in the first instance out of his own pocket, and look to the Treasury afterwards to be reimbursed, or is he to be at liberty to draw upon any bank for the amount he requires for these expenses? It will be observed that the very wholesome power which the judge now possesses of disallowing the costs of witnesses is wholly at an end, and any witness, though evidently a perjured one, *must* be paid.

Upon the whole, I am of opinion that no such statute as this contemplated is really required if the suggestions contained in the first part of this communication were to be carried out; and that even were the contemplated enactment to become law it would be found in practice to be productive of very much inconvenience and prejudice rather than promote the administration of criminal justice.

I have, &c.

THOS. WM. SAUNDERS,
Recorder of Bath.

From MR. DALTON.

Clerk of Peace's Office, Cardiff,
11th December 1872.

SIR, By order of the court of quarter sessions, I return a copy of Bill with remarks thereon.

I am, &c.

THO. DALTON,
Clerk of the Peace.

GLAMORGANSHIRE.—Michaelmas Quarter Sessions, 1872.

The chairman informed the Court that he had received a communication from the Secretary of State referring to a Bill brought in the last Session of Parliament for the appointment of public prosecutors, for the consideration of which he had given notice. Whereupon the deputy chairman, Mr. Fowler, said:—

“There is much to be said in favour of the principle of this Bill, but it appears to me that it is susceptible of improvement. It is proposed that there shall be one or more officers in each county called public prosecutors, appointed by the Secretary of State at salaries to be fixed by him, on the nomination to him of three persons by the local authority. The proposed officer is not to assist in criminal business before the magistrates. But after the accused has been committed for trial or bailed to appear he is to assume and effectually conduct the prosecution, for which end he is to be furnished with the depositions and all other papers and matters which are connected with the case. These are the leading features of the proposed office. The practical difference between the present and the proposed system will be as follows:—At present the committing magistrate binds over the individual who prefers the charge, or some other responsible person, to support the prosecution. In future no person is to be so bound over to prosecute for any felony and certain specified misdemeanors. That duty will devolve exclusively on a public prosecutor. But in actual practice the difference will be of less importance than at first sight would appear. For though a private individual is now bound over to prosecute, it always happens that an attorney is entrusted with every prosecution, and the work is in general very well done. It is obviously of the greatest importance that prosecutions should be placed in the hands of honourable and competent practitioners. I have heard that this Bill is specially directed against the touting for prosecutions by low and vulgar practitioners in the neighbourhood of the Central Criminal Court. In this county we have nothing to complain of, so far as I know, and I have no recollection of any failure of justice from the incompetence of any prosecuting attorney. But it must be admitted that it would be desirable that responsible and recognised public officers holding office during pleasure, and being experienced lawyers, should act for the public in criminal cases. But if the object of criminal proceedings is the protection of society by the conviction and punishment of guilty persons I doubt whether the appointment of a public prosecutor, as proposed by this Bill, will secure this object better than at present. Guilty criminals do not escape because we have no such officer. I quote from a very high authority the following words:—‘In the metropolis it is found that whenever evidence is bought off, the scene of perjury is neither the police court nor the sessions court, where the witnesses must speak under the check of publicity. It is laid in the chamber of the grand jury. Hence this body is called the first hope of the “London thief.” This tribunal sits in secret without attorneys, counsel, prisoner, or depositions, and the president plunges about in the dark without any previous knowledge of the circumstances. If the witnesses have been tampered with, or are stupid, he will fail to elicit the facts as told to the magistrate. He has no depositions in his hand to compare with the statement of the witness. No matter how false and dishonest the conduct of the witnesses may be, the grand jury must act upon what they choose to say, and ignore the bill when the evidence is insufficient, though a perfect case may have been disclosed to the committing magistrate.’” It appears to me, therefore, that if the object be to prevent the miscarriage of justice, one of two things should be included in this Bill. Either the functions of the grand jury should be abolished in ordinary cases, or the tribunal should be placed on a better footing by giving power to the public prosecutor to attend in the grand jury room with the depositions, and assist the foreman in bringing out the whole facts of the case as they were proved before the magistrate. He should also be empowered to explain the law wherever an explanation is required. Public prosecutors invested with these powers would greatly assist the administration of justice. It may perhaps be said that a miscarriage of justice very rarely takes place in the grand jury room. At the assizes that is no doubt the case. But at the sessions there are neither lawyers nor magistrates conversant with the criminal law sitting on the grand jury, and I have seen within the last twelve months four or five clear cases of coal stealing ignored by that tribunal.

The result would have been different if they had been reminded by a public prosecutor that in each case the person accused had been previously convicted of felony. It is evident that the presence of some official person would be of great advantage.

The relief of the county from all share in the cost of prosecutions after the appointment of public prosecutors will also be an inducement to assent to the Bill, and an act of national justice. I therefore take the liberty of suggesting that this Court should direct the clerk of the peace to return the Bill with our favourable opinion of the proposed appointment, coupled with a recommendation that the public prosecutor should have a *locus standi* in the grand jury room, and attend that tribunal with the depositions and the prisoner's statement before the magistrates, and otherwise assist the grand jury in any way they may desire.

Approved by the Court.

THO. DALTON,
Clerk of the Peace for Glamorgan.

From MR. BOSANQUET.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

Dingestow Court, near Monmouth,
12th December 1872.

IN obedience to your letter of the 15th August last, I have called a meeting of the active magistrates in this county, and consulted others, respecting the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors transmitted with your letter, and I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the observations and suggestions of the magistrates whom I have conferred with, in which I myself concur.

And I am, &c.

S. R. BOSANQUET,
Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Monmouthshire.

We think that the duties of the public prosecutor are not sufficiently defined.

The direction (sect. 3.) is, that he shall "conduct" prosecutions.

This does not say whether he shall conduct it both as attorney and counsel, or only as attorney, and as such instruct counsel.

The presumption is that he is to fulfil the two offices of prosecutor (who is now in general the principal witness) and attorney.

If he is to employ and instruct counsel it is not said whether he is to prepare the instructions with his own hand, or to employ clerks; and in what office.

It is not prescribed according to what rule he is to employ counsel and distribute his briefs.

If one public prosecutor should be appointed for a county he might give all his briefs to one counsel—his friend.

If one counsel held all the briefs the rest would cease to attend the sessions, and the Bar would be destroyed.

To avoid this, and for other following reasons, it appears to us that the best persons to fulfil the office are the clerks of petty sessions in their respective divisions.

They are chosen by magistrates as the fittest gentlemen in their neighbourhood.

They are acquainted with the neighbourhood and localities, and know where necessary witnesses may be found.

They are already acquainted with the circumstances of the case from having taken the depositions, and there is no need for a fresh person to learn them, and be paid for doing so.

Their appointment to the office would do away with the chief defect and failure in prosecutions, namely, that there is an uncertainty who is to conduct the case; and often it is got up and conducted by the police, and sometimes no one conducts it.

The imposing of the duty on a certain person, having responsibility, would obviate this, and secure the business being properly done.

We do not yield to the apprehension that clerks of petty sessions would multiply prosecutions for their own advantage.

This would be obviated by paying them by salary. But we are of opinion that payment by fees is not a greater inducement to multiply business than the certainty of a salary must be to neglect and stifle it.

The public prosecutor will not be able to pay the witnesses by his own hand, as they ought to be paid immediately on conclusion of the trial, and before they go home; and he will be engaged at the time in conducting the trials in court. He must therefore have an office and one or more clerks to have charge of and pay the money which he brings with him.

We suggest that three year's practice is not a sufficient qualification for the office; also, that the regulations framed by the Secretary of State ought to be laid before Parliament before they become operative.

We also further suggest that the criminal business would be considerably economized if pleas of guilty might be taken in the prison by a competent authority: the witnesses in such case having notice not to attend, and the prisoner being brought up before the Court for sentence.

We think that a time ought to be limited, in section 20, after which the adoption of the Act should be compulsory.

We think that the Bill does not provide for what would be one of the most useful duties of a public prosecutor, namely, prevention of the compounding of felonies, and of the escape of criminals by the favour or unwillingness of parties to prosecute.

For the Magistrates of the County,

S. R. BOSANQUET,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions, co. Monmouth.

From MR. DUNCOMBE.

Kilnwick Percy, Pocklington,

13th December 1872.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to acquaint you that at the last general quarter sessions of the peace for the East Riding of Yorkshire, the justices then assembled had under their consideration the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, which accompanied your circular letter to the clerk of the peace of that Riding, and in which you requested to be favoured with the opinion of the justices on such Bill, together with any suggestions which they might wish to offer thereon, and, as Chairman of the Court, I now beg leave to state that it was the unanimous opinion of the justices that such a measure is altogether unnecessary, so far at all events as regards the smaller towns and the country districts.

The Bill appears to contemplate that all preliminary proceedings shall be initiated, as heretofore, by private individuals or by the local police. If this be so the justices fail to perceive that any advantage would result from the subsequent transfer from these persons to a public prosecutor of the further conduct of the proceedings to trial, and, moreover, if a public prosecutor were appointed, the proceedings after commitment, though nominally conducted by him, must necessarily be attended to by some attorney or agent in the locality where the offence was committed, or by the local police as at present, as it would be impossible in a wide and extensive district that the public prosecutor could himself be personally present to get up the evidence and prepare the case for trial.

It also appears to the justices that the public interests and the administration of justice are greatly promoted by the presence of an independent Bar at the assizes and quarter sessions, and it may reasonably be apprehended that the appointment of a public prosecutor would weaken and lower the independence of the local Bar, by vesting in such public prosecutor the entire patronage of the criminal business of the district.

The existing law makes ample provision for the justices in counties, cities, and boroughs to direct prosecutions in all cases contemplated by the Bill to be undertaken by a public prosecutor, and in cases of great magnitude, or involving public considerations of much importance, it is competent for the Attorney-General to undertake the prosecution of any case which he may think fit.

The Court was also of opinion that any advantage which might, in exceptional cases, be attendant on the scheme provided by the Bill would not be commensurate with the cost and expense which it would involve, and, having regard to all the considerations before adverted to, the Court was unanimously opposed to the adoption of the measure.

I have, &c.

A. DUNCOMBE,
Chairman.

From GURNEY, COULARD, & COULARD.

SIR,

Launceston, 14th December 1872.

WE have submitted the print of the Bill herein to the justices of the petty sessional divisions of Tipton, in Devon, and north division of East Cornwall, and the

marginal notes in the print of Bill, which we forward by book-post with this, have suggested themselves.

We are, &c.

GURNEY, COULARD, & COULARD,
Clerks to Justices for the above places.

Section 3.

See section 4, which implies that the *conduct of the prosecution* means after committal for trial.

Section 4.

Recent legislation has prohibited clerks of justices in boroughs from conducting prosecutions. Why the change? Now the clerk, as representing the justices, holds the depositions as between the Crown and the persons, and returns them to the Court. Why should they be given up to an *ex parte* prosecutor? Who is to provide for the witnesses for the defence?

Section 5.

See section 4.—The prosecutor is said either to *conduct* or *institute*. Why the introduction of the general term “prosecute” here?

Section 6.

Query.—Why a separate public prosecutor for a borough? But see interpretation clause, limiting this to boroughs having separate courts of quarter sessions.

Section 8.

Query the prudence of this unless in case of illness.

Section 20.

Should it not be compulsory?

From Mr. FORD.

SIR,

The Castle, Exeter, 18th December 1872.

I HAVE the honour to transmit a copy of observations and resolutions on the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors made by a committee, consisting of the chairmen of quarter sessions of this county, appointed at the last quarter sessions upon your circular of the 15th August last being laid before the court.

I have, &c.

H. FORD,

Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF DEVON.

At a Meeting of the Committee for considering the Bill for the Appointment of Public Prosecutors.

RESOLVED, that this committee approves of the principle of the Bill so far as relates to the appointment of public prosecutors, and so far as the duties of such prosecutors are expressed in clause 3, subject to the following observations:—

Section 3.

“We do not clearly understand whether it is intended by section 3 to impose on the public prosecutor the duty of instituting, as well as of conducting, prosecutions in respect of offences coming within the first schedule.
“We think he should have this duty imposed on him, subject to any regulations made by the Secretary of State.

Section 7.

“We are of opinion that the recommendation of the local authority in respect of a person to fill the office of prosecutor upon a vacancy should be of one person and not three, as there may be a great difficulty in finding suitable persons, unless the district is large or populous.

Section 9.

" We entertain grave doubt whether the restrictions are not too numerous, and whether, if they are retained, it would be possible in some districts to obtain the services of a suitable person.

Section 13.

" We think that inasmuch as at present each magistrate has the power to appoint his own clerk it would be desirable that the number of magistrates' clerks should be restricted to as many petty sessional divisions or sub-divisions thereof as are recognized by the court of quarter sessions.

Section 20.

" We are of opinion that if the Act be passed it should be compulsory in all counties and boroughs, and not permissive, as indicated by this section."

From the BERKS JUSTICES.

SIR,

Englefield House, Reading, December 1872.

REFERRING to your circular of last summer on this subject, wherein you request the opinion of justices who take an active interest in the affairs of this county as to the proposed Bill, and limiting our answer to the portion providing for a public prosecutor, and to the only experience which we have, viz., of a rural and agricultural population, we are of opinion that the present system works very well, except in rare cases, and that these would be amply provided for if a power were vested, under proper control, in some local authority to direct a professional man to act on behalf of the public, and that this power should certainly extend to the proceedings before the committal of the accused, the expenses of such proceedings being met in the same way as the expenses after committal.

RICHARD BENYON,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions, Berks.

GEORGE C. CHERRY,

Deputy Chairman.

M. L. THOYTE,

Chairman of Petty Sessions at Reading.

J. R. LEIGH MONCK.

CHARLES EYRE.

WM. GEORGE MOUNT.

From MR. HARRISON.

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Welchpool,

21st December 1872.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to forward you a copy of the observations of the committee appointed by the court of quarter sessions to consider the above measure, and communicate with you thereon, as desired by your circular letter of the 16th September last.

I have also the honour to enclose you copy of a letter received by me from Captain Crewe-Read, one of the justices who was unable to attend the meeting of the committee, relative to the same measure.

I remain, &c.

R. D. HARRISON,

Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

OBSERVATIONS of the Committee appointed by the Court of Quarter Sessions for the County of Montgomery.

IN accordance with a circular letter received by the clerk of the peace from the Secretary of State, dated 16th September 1872, the committee desired the clerk of the peace to communicate to the Secretary of State on the part of the county that their experience would not lead them to consider the appointment of a public prosecutor necessary for the county of Montgomery; that they, therefore, decline expressing an opinion on the policy of creating such an office.

That if the appointment of a public prosecutor were optional the county would probably not think it necessary to adopt the Act.

That in the event of such an appointment being made compulsory they think that its cost should not be thrown on the ratepayers.

That the appointment should be made in such manner and by such authority as to give ample security and confidence that political or electioneering considerations have not been allowed to enter into or to influence it.

DEAR SIR,

Llandinam, Montgomeryshire,
11th December 1872.

WITH reference to your note, dated 30th September last, forwarding me a copy of Bill received from Secretary of State for the appointment of public prosecutors, and requesting me to furnish you with my opinion thereon, for the information of that gentleman, I beg to acquaint you that I quite approve of the provisions of the Bill, except in the powers contained therein being made *permissive* as to their adoption in counties instead of compulsory.

I regret my inability to attend yesterday when this subject was brought before a committee for a report thereon to the next quarter sessions.

I am, &c.

O. M. CREWE-READ.

From MR. GIBSON.

SIR, Ongar, 23rd December 1872.

I BEG to inform you that your letter of the 16th of September ultimo, with a copy of the Bill for appointment of public prosecutors, was at the last Michaelmas quarter session referred by the court to the parliamentary committee, who were empowered to send a reply to the same in the name of and as from the court, and I beg, by the direction of the committee, to send you, on the other side, a copy of the resolutions passed by them on the subject of the Bill.

I am, &c.

H. GIBSON,
Clerk of the Peace for Essex.

COPY RESOLUTIONS of Parliamentary Committee for the County of Essex with
reference to the Public Prosecutors Bill.

1. That the principle of appointment of public prosecutor be approved, provided the law be made compulsory and not permissive.

2. That it is desirable that the public prosecutor be appointed by the local authority, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.

3. That the appointment of a deputy by a public prosecutor be subject to the approval of the local authority.

4. That unless a public prosecutor be appointed for each petty sessional division of a county (on which the committee have not sufficient information to express a decided opinion) they cannot recommend the appointment of clerks to justices in petty sessions as public prosecutors.

5. That the Secretary of State's attention be called to the propriety of allowing expenses incurred prior to attending before justices, and of allowing the prisoners' or defendants' witnesses (if the judge certifies), even without subpoena or recognizance.

6. That there should be an addition to section 13 of the Bill, that where clerks are paid by salary payment of fees by stamps should be compulsory.

And, lastly, ought not the words "extent of repeal" in Schedule 2 to be "sections referred to." See clauses 11 and 19.

From MR. WILKINSON.

Clerk of the Peace's Office,
16, Coney Street, York,
24th December 1872.

SIR, I HAVE the honour to acquaint you that, as desired by your communication in reference to the above matter, I forwarded a copy of the Bill which accompanied

that communication to each of the magistrates of this city, and requested to be favoured with a statement of their opinions and suggestions thereon, and I have now the honour to transmit to you herewith a copy of resolutions passed by the justices at a special sessions held for the purpose of considering the Bill referred to.

I am, &c.

JOS. WILKINSON,
Clerk of the Peace.

GUILDHALL, YORK, 2nd December 1872.

SPECIAL SESSION of the Magistrates to consider the Bill proposed to be introduced into Parliament for the appointment of Public Prosecutors.

PRESENT:

The Lord Mayor,
Dr. Shann, W. C. Anderson, Ralph Weatherley,
Joshua Oldfield, Edwin Wade, and William Walker, Esquires.

Resolved unanimously—

1. That inasmuch as it is contemplated by the Bill that all preliminary proceedings shall be undertaken as heretofore by private individuals, or by the local police, no advantage would result from the transfer from them to the public prosecutor of the further conduct of such proceedings to trial.

2. That if a public prosecutor were appointed, the proceedings after commitment for trial, though nominally in his charge, would in fact be conducted by an agent in the locality where the offence was committed, or by the local police, as at present.

3. That the appointment of a public prosecutor would inevitably weaken the local Bar by vesting in him the entire patronage of the criminal business of the district.

4. That such appointment would necessarily be attended with considerable cost without providing any real or commensurate advantage to the public.

5. That by the existing law ample power is provided for the justices in counties, cities, and boroughs to direct prosecutions in all cases contemplated by the Bill to be undertaken by such officer.

6. That it is now competent for the Attorney General to undertake the prosecution of any case which he may think fit to direct.

7. That if the Treasury would revise the scale of and increase the allowance to witnesses and others engaged in prosecutions much good would result therefrom, it being notorious that there is at present a great disinclination amongst many persons to volunteer evidence from the certainty that they will by so doing suffer pecuniary loss.

8. For these reasons this meeting is of opinion there does not exist any necessity for the appointment of such a public prosecutor as is proposed by the Bill now under consideration.

9. That a copy of the foregoing resolutions be sent to the clerk of the peace for transmission by him to the Secretary of State.

(Signed) HENRY STEWARD,
Mayor.

SUGGESTIONS made by Mr. HENRY JONES, of Colchester, Clerk to Justices for the Division of Lexden and Winstree.

That public prosecutors should have equal rights of audience with counsel.

That each petty sessional division should have a seal.

That clerks to justices should have power to receive informations and issue summons under the seal and the hand of such clerk (as in the County Courts).

That every clerk to justices should have power to administer oaths out of court.

That summonses to and orders on defendants living out of the petty sessional division in which the summonses are issued may be served by any constable in defendant's district, and the service thereof proved by affidavit.

That every chief police officer having charge of a station should have power to admit offenders in certain cases punishable by summary conviction to bail as head constables now have in boroughs.

That in certain cases the public prosecutors should also have power to institute and prosecute proceedings before justices in petty sessions.

From MR. MOODY.

SIR,

Scarborough, 27th December 1872.

IN compliance with the directions contained in your letter to me of the 16th September last I beg to inform you that I duly forwarded copies of this Bill to the Recorder for this borough, and to several of the magistrates who take an active part in attending quarter sessions, and enclosed I send you the replies I have received from them.

I have, &c.

I. J. P. MOODY,

Clerk of the Peace.

DEAR SIR, 3, Essex Court, Temple, E.C.,
21st November 1872.

I HAVE considered this Bill as amended in committee, and concur generally in the principle and policy of the measure.

With regard to the *preparation of cases for trial*, I think that greater powers should be given to public prosecutors than appear to be conferred by the Bill as it stands. I have not unfrequently found prosecutions imperilled and even fail from the absence of some additional evidence which could have been easily procured, though at some extra expense, and the want of which was obvious. The committing magistrates often bind over to prosecute, &c. no more witnesses than they think necessary to justify a committal or the finding of a true bill; but the depositions, the prisoners' statements, or other matters that may transpire often disclose fresh sources of evidence and inquiry. When the *magistrates' clerks* are the prosecuting attorneys, from their official knowledge of the case and their constant communication with the police, they are often able to procure the necessary additional evidence at little or no expense; but where other attorneys have the conduct of the prosecution, they usually know nothing beyond what the depositions disclose, and hesitate to incur personal expense in strengthening the case from a fear of the disallowance of costs on taxation. I would suggest that power should be given to a public prosecutor, expressly in the Bill itself, to incur such necessary expense in further investigation of the case and procuring additional evidence, and to require the aid of the chief constables or superintendent of police in so doing.

(Section 6.) With regard to the "*qualification*" for the office of attorneys (not being clerks to the magistrates), I doubt whether three years' practice in the district is sufficient, and think a public prosecutor should be of at least seven years' standing in his profession.

I remain, &c.

A. W. SIMPSON,

Recorder of Scarborough.

WE, the undersigned magistrates for the borough of Scarborough, having perused or otherwise been made acquainted with the provisions of this Bill, and having read and considered the opinions and suggestions thereon of Alfred W. Simpson, Esq., the Recorder of the borough, concur generally with him in all that he suggests, especially in the remark, "When the magistrates' clerks are the prosecuting attorneys their official knowledge renders them the most eligible."

H. T. LAYE.	M. F. MARPIN.
HENRY FOWLER.	HODGSON SMITH.
WILLIAM HOLDEN.	ROBERT CHAMPLEYNE.

From MR. LOVELL.

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Wells, Somerset,

28th December 1872.

SIR,

IN compliance with your letter of the 6th September last, I sent a copy of the Bill and of your circular to 40 magistrates, and I now send you the opinions of four, namely, Mr. Thring, one of the deputy chairmen, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Ireland, and Mr. Welman.

I am, &c.

EDWIN LOVELL.

December 1872.

THE necessity for the partition of England into districts and the appointment of public prosecutors throughout the country must depend upon the proved deficiency of the present system.

What, then, is that system, and in what does it fail?

Public prosecutors are already officially installed for all Government departments, all local corporations, and public boards, in the persons of the solicitors to such bodies. I would instance the Post Office as a department in which the very numerous criminal prosecutions are invariably well conducted, though at a somewhat considerable cost.

In all ordinary cases of crime, either against the person or property of individuals, the person injured puts himself in communication with the police. The police get up the evidence for committal, and the clerk to the magistrates conducts the case at the trial, unless the private prosecutor prefers to select his own attorney and counsel. Either way the costs (as far as the public is concerned) are the same and paid out of the same fund.

This system, in my opinion, fails in two or three points, which have no affinity with each other:—

1. In the metropolis and other great centres of population, such as Manchester and Liverpool, the borough and county jurisdictions run into each other; stipendiary magistrates constitute the court of first instance in the boroughs, and there is no machinery for the conduct of criminal charges after committal for trial. Consequently, within certain prescribed limits, in great cities and their suburbs, the appointment of a public prosecutor is very desirable.

2. In bankruptcy offences, where the wrong is usually more of a public than a private character, and the individuals injured are often so implicated in questionable transactions that they are very unwilling to appear in support of the charge. Further, the conduct of the proceedings requires an intimate acquaintance with a peculiar branch of law, and skill in unravelling complicated facts, otherwise the prosecutions fail, and the failures are very costly, as well as most detrimental to the public interest. The remedy here must be special, and the best appointment would be that of some practised official from the Court of Bankruptcy in London, and from the County Courts in the country, to initiate and conduct the prosecution of such offenders through all its stages.

3. Great crimes are occasionally committed, surrounded with circumstances of unusual difficulty both as regards the discovery of the offender and the tracing the skein of the evidence, which points against suspected persons. Here the magistrate or court of petty sessions ought to be able to call in the aid of the Home Office immediately. A public prosecutor with a small staff of detectives under the orders of the Home Secretary should be always ready to start for the scene of such crimes at once. Their practised skill would unravel many a mystery and bring the criminal to justice, where at present the slow and untrained action of the local authorities fails.

I have recounted these instances, because they appear to me to be the only exceptions in which the appointment of a public prosecutor would conduce to the public advantage, and such exceptions are better met by limited regulations than by a change of system.

Now what is the the general remedy projected? The Bill (with the exception of the metropolis) proposes to use the same instruments as now before committal and after committal, to select a certain number from the clerks of the justices as public prosecutors for the purpose of conducting the same class of business in the same manner as the whole body of clerks already do, but at a considerably increased cost. In fact, there is a creation of new officials without any adequate result.

It is the fashion just now to cite the Scotch system as an example for English procedure. But secrecy and seclusion form the groundwork of the Scotch system. From first to last the accused is ignorant of the name of his accuser and of the nature of the evidence against him until he is served with the libel. When committed for further examination he is kept in seclusion without access to his friends or legal advisers.* When his declaration is taken, no person, except officials, may be present. On the other hand, the sheriff and the procurator fiscal consult together on the pre-cognition or preliminary arrangement of the evidence, which is afterwards adduced before the same sheriff as judge. What would be said in England were a stipendiary

* Mr. Russell's Paper on Criminal Prosecutions in Scotland. Scottish Society for Amendment of Law, 1869-70.

magistrate and his clerk to get up the evidence for a trial to be held before the stipendiary himself? It must not be forgotten that many Scotch jurists are urging an approximation to the fair and open character of the English criminal system, whilst the English, on the other hand, wish to borrow a public prosecutor from Scotch procedure.

Having stated the objections to the principle of the Bill, I will add a few observations on the provisions contained in the clauses.

4. It is questionable whether a public prosecutor (if employed) ought not to intervene before the case is brought before the magistrates.

5, line 25. This application, if to be of any practical use, ought to be made to a court of summary jurisdiction.

6. It is without doubt most desirable that clerks to justices should be paid by salary, but it is highly inexpedient that the best men should be excluded from the office of public prosecutor because at the time of the passing of the Act they happen to belong to a county in which the clerks are still paid by fees. Such is the effect of this clause.

10. The Treasury must either employ the present taxing officers, *i.e.*, the clerk of assize and clerk of the peace, or institute a new system which would involve increased expense.

12. The witnesses for the accused ought *not* to be included, but their expenses should only be allowed on application *to* and certificate *by* the presiding judge. If these costs were paid as a matter of course, the temptation to suborn witnesses and fabricate alibis would be irresistible amongst the criminal classes, and the very multiplication of false evidence in courts of justice would have a bad effect on society at large.

I am, &c.

THEODORE THRING.

A Deputy Chairman of Quarter Sessions for Somerset.

From MR. IRELAND.

SIR, Brislington, near Bristol, 28th November 1872.

IN reply to your letter to the clerk of the peace for Somerset, dated the 16th day of September last, and asking for the opinions of justices of that county on the Public Prosecutors Bill, and for such suggestions as such justices may desire to offer thereon, I have the honour to submit the following observations:—

The only cases in which I have noticed an apparent failure of justice from want of a public prosecutor have been cases in which members of the police force were prohibited from initiating proceedings, and in which the costs of a prosecutor are not allowed. It thus occurs to me to suggest that the appointment of attorneys as public prosecutors is unnecessary, and that the chief officers of police might with advantage be appointed such prosecutors, with authority to instruct an attorney upon commitment for trial of a prisoner, or, in their discretion, at an earlier stage of the proceedings.

I see no reason for restricting the criminal proceedings which a public prosecutor may, in the exercise of his discretion, institute. I think it important that he should be permitted to indict individuals, or public bodies, for neglect of public duties, such as the duty of constructing or maintaining a public road or bridge.

A clerk to justices should not be permitted to act as public prosecutor before the justices to whom he is acting as clerk. By such a course the justices would be deprived of that impartial legal advice, their possession of which is perhaps the chief security for the due administration of justice by untrained administrators.

Regarding as I do the general adoption of a system of payment of clerks of the peace and clerks to justices by salaries in lieu of fees as particularly desirable, on account of the facility that would thereby be afforded for the abolition of the vexatious charges upon suitors contained in the existing tables of fees, I would venture to suggest that the fees to be demanded by such clerks as are paid by salary be set forth in a schedule to the Bill.

I have, &c.

JAMES CLAYFIELD IRELAND.

From MR. BENNETT.

SIR, Sparkford, Ilchester, 23rd November 1872.

IN reply to the circular which, by the direction of Mr. Secretary Bruce, was transmitted to the clerk of the peace for the county of Somerset, and of which a copy

was forwarded to me, I beg to say that I think the appointment of public prosecutors expedient, but that to provide that their duties should not attach until after commitment would not ensure that certainty of punishment following crime which, as it seems to me, is the strongest argument of the institution. As regards small crimes especially there is, as matters stand, no such certainty. Sufferers by crime frequently prefer putting up with their loss to incurring the trouble, expense, and annoyance of what are simply deterrent, not compensatory, prosecutions; prosecutions in which the public are nearly as much interested as they are.

Public prosecutors to be of much use must begin at the beginning—initiate prosecutions or take them up at an early stage; but to enable them to do this their districts must be of manageable size, not simply counties, certainly. A county public prosecutor with petty sessional deputies is what is wanted, and less would be a waste of money. It should be the duty of the police of his district to notify the petty sessional public prosecutor of all crime coming within their knowledge, and aid him in its investigation; it should be his duty to prosecute for all crime coming to his knowledge, whether through the police or otherwise, if there is in his opinion evidence enough to render a conviction probable. He should be empowered (but without at all ousting the existing rights of magistrates) to summon parties and witnesses, and, when necessary, to obtain a justice's warrant to compel attendance. He should, where justices initiate proceedings, be bound to take up and conduct the case. Where unprosecuted crime comes to the knowledge of the county public prosecutor, as to which (whatever his deputy may think) he thinks there is sufficient evidence to warrant proceedings, he should be authorised to direct the deputy of the venue to prosecute. It should be the duty of petty sessional public prosecutors to conduct to conviction all matters of summary jurisdiction, and all others to commitment, after which the county prosecutor would take them up.

I think the petty sessional justices' clerks and the clerks of the peace are, as a rule, the proper persons to be public prosecutors, and at the same time the least expensive. Expense is no doubt the ruling objection to any scheme, and may be out of all proportion to its advantages. To the existing clerks, however, the new work would be a lesser interference with their private practice and involve a smaller additional office expense than to any others, and their being paid by salary instead of fees would obviate all objection to their being concerned in prosecutions. Again, payment by a salary, equalling in amount present fees, in lieu of such fees, individually small and uncertain as to time, is a gain; a gain which would go some way towards remunerating them for additional work. Independently of this I think the substitution of salaries for fees is a desirable change; I also think that the collection of the latter by stamps is desirable, and would prevent much of the loss which now accrues, and greatly simplify the keeping of accounts.

The Local Stamp Act, 32 & 33 Vict. c. 49, should be made compulsory, and imported into the proposed Act. As matters stand that Act applies only to commutations under the 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55, and would be a dead letter as to all others.

Under the 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. clerks may be paid partly by salary and partly by fees, and the latter part of section 13 of the proposed Act implies that such might still be the case; at the same time, if any case exists of such partial payment at the passing of the Act, the word "wholly," in the early part of this clause, would compel a repetition of what has already been done, though probably with no different result.

The words "regard being had, &c.," in section 7, convey no very clear idea of what is intended.

I have, &c.
H. E. BENNETT.

From MR. WELMAN.

13th October 1872.

I HOPE the Bill may pass, except the clause of "recommendation by local authority as to public prosecutors." It gives no power whatever to the justices, but only such trouble as the Dean and Chapter have in the election of bishops.

I am, &c.
C. NOEL WELMAN.

From MR. WORTHAM.

Office of Clerk of the Peace for Cambridgeshire,
Cambridge, 28th December 1872.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to report that, in accordance with the desire expressed in a letter sent by you some two months back, I forwarded copies of this Bill to the chairman and the two vice-chairmen of quarter sessions, and to such other of the justices as I thought likely to take an interest in the subject, with a request that they would (if they thought proper) make such observations thereon as appeared to them expedient, and transmit them to you (through me) before the 31st instant. And further to inform you that I have at present received such observations from the two vice-chairmen only, fair copies of which I, at their request, now enclose.

May I be permitted to call your attention to section 9 of the Bill, and with reference to that part of it which prohibits public prosecutors from acting as agents for candidates at elections of members to serve in Parliament to observe that such a prohibition will seriously diminish the ranks from which respectable persons can be selected for the office; and that this remark applies especially to counties.

I have, &c.

HALE WORTHAM,
Clerk of the Peace.

P.S.—Since the above was written another justice for Cambridgeshire has pointed out a defect in section 5, in this, that although a private person may be authorised by a court or judge to conduct a prosecution in lieu of the public prosecutor, yet that such private person can only get an order for costs in the event of the offender being convicted. H. W.

From MR. HICKS.

DEAR SIR, Wilbraham Temple, December 1872.

You asked me to forward you my opinion as a vice-chairman of quarter sessions of the Public Prosecutors Bill.

My decided opinion is that no such measure is needed in this and similar districts, that it would not work here, and if it did, it would do harm.

It would be difficult to find gentlemen fitted for and willing to accept the office, and if you could it would so materially diminish the value of the present clerkships of petty sessions that it would be next to impossible to find proper gentlemen to fill those important offices. My own opinion is that in the absence of a responsible private prosecutor, able and willing to take the responsibility, the clerks of petty sessions should be appointed ex-officio prosecutors. They have already drawn out the depositions, and they can conduct the case at less cost than any new officer, besides the fact that they have to conduct the prosecution would render them more careful in taking depositions.

In addition to this, however, I would authorise the Home Office to appoint as standing counsel one or more barristers of acknowledged position at the criminal bar, to whom, in cases of difficulty, clerks of petty sessions, with the direction of committing magistrates, might apply for advice as to what further evidence should be produced, or any other points of doubt.

I would also require chief constables of police in all cases of felony or indictable misdemeanor, where the party injured will not put the law in motion, at once to assume the place of prosecutor, and call upon the party injured to give evidence.

These views (with the exception of the last, which was not mentioned,) met with the general approval of the Society of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions held at Lord Dudley's in April last.

Believe me, &c.

E. HICKS,

Vice-Chairman.

From MR. SPERLING.

SUCH a functionary as a public prosecutor is not in my opinion desirable in counties. I deprecate the restriction imposed by section 9 upon clerks of petty sessions, who are, in my opinion, highly proper persons to conduct prosecutions. My experience as chairman of St. Ives and Caxton divisions leads me to this conclusion. I have never known of any abuse in their conduct or prosecutions, nor in advising,

for their own purposes, that any prisoner or person charged should be committed for trial.

It might be advisable to empower justices' clerks to prosecute in all cases in the absence of the prosecutor, or when he is unwilling, and it is thought right that a prosecution should be instituted.

Or in some cases the police might be ordered to prosecute, and the prosecutor be called as a witness.

For particular and very exceptional cases resort might be had by clerks of petty sessions to the advice of some special expert in criminal cases appointed for that purpose.

The cost to the county of carrying out this Bill would be very great and, except perhaps in the metropolis, needless.

ARTHUR SPERLING,
Vice-Chairman.

From ARTHUR R. ADAMS.

St. John's College Oxford,
30th December 1872.

SIR,

IN reply to your circular requesting me to give you my opinion of the provisions of the Bill intituled "Public Prosecutors Bill," I have to state that in the borough of Birmingham the town council some years ago appointed an attorney to conduct all such prosecutions as were instituted by persons who did not desire to have their cases conducted by their own attorney, and that, except in a few instances at each sessions, the prosecutions have been conducted by him; but he does not attend before the committing magistrates, nor does he interfere with the conduct of the prosecutions until after the depositions have been taken and the prisoner committed for trial. This plan has not worked unsatisfactorily, and it has enabled the clerk of the peace to get through the drawing of the indictments with greater facility; but I am not prepared to say that any marked result in the detection of crime or conviction of felons has been obtained; this, however, may arise not from any defect on the part of the gentleman who has been appointed to the office, but from the fact that he is not put in motion until the case is ready for hearing, and knows nothing of the depositions until shortly before the trial takes place. I am not aware that any cases have arisen in the borough where a failure of justice has taken place from the non-appointment of a "public prosecutor," and when crimes have been committed and reported to the police, and the criminal has been apprehended, a prosecution has ordinarily followed. I do not, however, mean to assert that prosecutors come forward in all cases, nor do they always prosecute the cases with effect after the prisoner has been committed, but I am of opinion that in the great majority of cases a "public prosecutor," such as is intended by the present Bill to be appointed, would not have obtained a better result than what is now had; and that where a prosecutor is unwilling to prosecute, a "public prosecutor" would seldom succeed in obtaining a conviction, as an unwilling prosecutor would always be an unwilling witness, and the jury would undoubtedly be told by a counsel for the prisoner, that if the prosecutor cannot speak with certainty as to the facts, and that as he was not willing to prosecute, they ought not to come to a conclusion against the prisoner, which the person most materially interested declines to draw. It may perhaps be said that a person does not prosecute with effect, because he has been induced, by promises of money or by threats, to retire, and that a "public prosecutor" is therefore needed; but I wish to point out that if a person has accepted money to forego a prosecution, the jury would pay but little attention to his evidence, and he would be described as a "tainted witness;" and that the cases where threats have been successful in causing the withdrawal of a prosecution are very few indeed. In ordinary cases, then, I am of opinion that no great advantage would be obtained by the appointment of a "public prosecutor" in this borough, and I think that in extraordinary cases application might be made either to the Home Office or to the Attorney General, and that a local attorney might then be selected to conduct the case. But, as I have also practised at quarter sessions in the county of Warwick for many years, and since my appointment as Recorder of the borough of Birmingham have acted as a magistrate for that county, I think it right to add that the proposal to appoint the clerks of the petty sessional divisions as public prosecutors would not in any way improve the present practice, and that section 9, which prevents a "public prosecutor" from being the agent for a candidate at an election, would clearly eliminate from the list of persons who could be

appointed "public prosecutors" all the attorneys in the division who have the largest business and are most trusted by their clients; nor do I think that there is any probability that a clerk to justices would ever use his influence at the present time in an improper manner. It is highly improbable, now that a bench of magistrates is of one way of thinking, and it is of great importance, if "public prosecutors" are to be appointed, that the most respectable attorneys should be selected.

I venture to express my entire approval of sections 10, 11, and 12.

I have, &c.

ARTHUR R. ADAMS,
Recorder of the Borough of Birmingham.

From MR. READ.

SIR,

Sessions House, Old Bailey,
31st December 1872.

IN compliance with the request contained in your letter to me, dated 16th September last, I forwarded copies of the Public Prosecutors Bill to the magistrates for the City of London, who, having taken the subject into their consideration, now desire me to send to you the enclosed copy of their resolutions and suggestions.

I am, &c.

EDWARD JAMES READ,
Clerk of the Peace.

At a meeting of the committee of Her Majesty's justices of the peace for the City of London, holden at the Guildhall, in the said city, on the 30th day of December 1872, a letter from the Secretary of State inviting the opinion of the magistrates attending quarter sessions upon the proposed Public Prosecutors Bill having been laid before the last Michaelmas quarter sessions of the peace, and by the justices then present referred to this committee, and the provisions of the said Bill having been duly considered, the following suggestions were made:—

1. In the event of the appointment of a public prosecutor the magistrates of the City of London should have the same privileges with regard to his appointment at the Central Criminal Court as those proposed to be conferred upon all other parts of the kingdom, and should be constituted the "Local Authority" for London, for the following reasons:—The magistrates of London, in the interests of public convenience and economy, do not exercise a separate criminal jurisdiction at their quarter sessions, and, as the whole of the City of London is included within the district of the Central Criminal Court, commit for trial at that court all those cases which they have jurisdiction to try at their quarter sessions.

The Lord Mayor of London is the Chief Commissioner of the Central Criminal Court, the aldermen are quorum commissioners, and attend each sitting of the court; the court-house is provided and maintained by the Corporation, and the salaries of the permanent judges of the court, viz., the Recorder, Common Serjeant, and Judge of the Sheriffs' Court, are paid by the Corporation.

2. The public prosecutor should hold office during good behaviour, and should be removable by the courts of justice, and not by the Crown.

3. That private individuals and public companies should have the power to conduct their own prosecutions, unless the magistrates should direct the public prosecutor to take charge of the case.

4. That the public prosecutor should institute and conduct all prosecutions when required to do so by the magistrates, and his duties should not be in any case limited to conducting cases committed for trial, nor to the offences mentioned in the first schedule. The magistrates think that the usefulness of the office of public prosecutor will be very seriously impaired if the duties are so limited. It is a clear defect in the administration of justice that the prosecutions of offences involving serious cost are not initiated where the persons wronged have not the means of defraying or are unwilling to defray the cost of prosecution.

5. That the provisions of the Bill as to payment of costs should be extended to all cases investigated by the magistrates and committed for trial.

The magistrates are of opinion that the proposed measure will occasion a very large increase of public expenditure, and suggest that by giving a discretion to the magistrate as to the necessity in certain cases for availing themselves of the services of

a public prosecutor, and to the courts a discretion as to the payment of witnesses, a saving may properly be effected, and with this view they recommend the insertion of a clause rendering it unnecessary to commit for investigation by a grand jury and for trial the cases of offenders who after being duly cautioned by the magistrates plead guilty before them; and providing that in such cases the offender should be committed to the proper custody and be dealt with by the court in all respects as though he had pleaded guilty to an indictment for the offence charged in the commitment, and that the court should have power upon sufficient cause shown to permit the offender to withdraw the plea of guilty, and thereupon that the court should direct him to be indicted and tried in the usual manner.

6. That the right of public departments of the Crown to conduct prosecutions should be extended to the City of London or the solicitor thereof, and provision should be made that such costs as the public prosecutor would have incurred if he had conducted the prosecution should be reimbursed by him to the City solicitor or other officer conducting the prosecution. The prosecutions instituted by the City of London are not of a local nature, but are instituted in the interests of public safety, and the administration of justice to all Her Majesty's subjects, whether citizens of London or not.

7. That the provisions contained in section 4 will cause great inconvenience, expense, and delay in many cases; the magistrates should be directed to transmit copies of the depositions to the public prosecutor, and to deliver the originals as soon as practicable to the court.

8. That the 5th section will need amendment if the first schedule be omitted, otherwise it will repeal 14 & 15 Vict. c. 100. s. 19., and 22 & 23 Vict. c. 17. s. 2.

9. That the 12th section needs amendment, as it deprives the court of its control over the costs even if the witnesses misconduct themselves, and will give the right to witnesses for the accused to claim their costs without reference to the opinion of the court, and vests the discretion of payment in the public prosecutor.

10. That the 19th section should vest in the court the power of directing its own officers to aid the public prosecutor in taxing and regulating the costs, otherwise these officers will not be under the control of the court in dealing with this portion of their ministerial functions.

11. That the 17th section appears to require revision. There is now no law of forfeiture, and if an order of restitution be refused, the clause should direct what is to be done with the property referred to.

As the clause stands, it may be doubtful whether the owner could maintain an action against the thief or other wrong-doer.

FROM MR. DONNITHORN.

SIR,

Fareham, Hants, 30th December 1872.

HAVING perused, as clerk to the magistrates for the division of Fareham, a copy of the "Public Prosecutors Bill," as intended to be introduced into Parliament, I beg to suggest that a clause should be introduced into the Bill giving to magistrates' clerks the power to grant summonses under the seal of the division, authenticated, if need be, by the signature of the clerk, in substitution for the present practice, and for this purpose the magistrates' clerk should also be empowered to take the information, whether such information is on oath or not on oath.

In order that you may better understand why I venture to make the above suggestion I beg to state the present practice, which is as follows:—

A person requiring a summons attends at the magistrates' clerk's office, where the information and summons are made out. The applicant has then to take the information and summons to a magistrate, and depose to the former, and obtain the signature of the magistrate to the latter. The applicant then takes the information and summons to a police constable, and he serves the summons and returns the information to the clerk to the magistrates.

At first sight the laying of the information and obtaining the summons would appear but a small matter, and easily accomplished, and so it is; but when it is remembered that an applicant may travel many miles from his house to reach the clerk's office, and that afterwards he may have to travel as many miles more, or wait about for hours, to lay his information and get his summons signed by a magistrate, it really becomes to a poor man or woman, by reason of the loss of time necessarily involved, a matter of consequence, and an injury for which a remedy should be found.

My suggestion is to assimilate the practice with respect to the issuing of summonses in all criminal and petty sessional matters to the practice of issuing plaints in the County Courts. I do not of course propose to give to magistrates' clerks the power to issue such warrants, or warrants for the apprehension of persons (although in very many this, too, may be very well entrusted to the magistrates' clerks), but simply to empower them to take informations and issue summonses.

This additional advantage, too, would be gained by the adoption of some such course as I have suggested, namely, that the magistrates would hear the matter for the first time on the hearing of the summons, and with unbiassed minds, whereas now the magistrate who signs the summons hears the complainant's story, and is to some extent biassed.

I am, &c.

NICHOLAS DONNITHORN,
Clerk to the Justices.

From MR. HODDING.

SIR, Salisbury, 31st December 1872.

As requested by your circular of the 16th September last, I forwarded to the magistrates for this city a copy of the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, with a request that they would consider it and furnish me with their views.

I have only received one reply, and in that the magistrate says, "I do not think that any measure of the kind is required either in this city or in the county of Wilts, in which I have also the honour to act as a justice. I think that far too extensive and even *legislative* powers are given by the Bill to a Secretary of State. I am not myself in favour of paying justices' clerks by salary instead of fees, because I think the public suffer from having to pay the salary and the fees also."

I have, &c.

FRANCIS HODDING,
Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. DIXON.

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Wakefield,

SIR, 31st December 1872.

IN accordance with the request contained in your circular dated 16th of September last, I have the honour to send you herewith four letters from West Riding magistrates who are known to take an active part in attending quarter sessions, stating their several opinions upon the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, of which copies were sent to this office.

I have, &c.

JOHN H. DIXON,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. DARWIN.

Inverliever House, Lochgilphead, N.B.,

DEAR SIR, 31st October 1872.

I HAVE to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Public Prosecutors Bill, with your circular asking me to favour you with my views on it, in order that you may communicate them to the Home Secretary.

I have therefore perused the Bill with such attention as I am capable of, and whilst quite of opinion that the object of the Bill is desirable, doubt very much whether, when put in force, it will carry out the intentions of its promoters.

The Bill commences by defining what the duties of a public prosecutor are to be, but gives a power to a Secretary of State to make, revoke, and alter regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of the Act, even so far as to determine what criminal proceedings public prosecutors are or are not to institute, or conduct, or appear in.

This power I would suggest is far too great, for it would authorise a Secretary of State to override, should he be so determined, the evident intention of the Bill by forbidding the prosecution of any offence by the public prosecutor, although it might be one of a class included in the first schedule of the Bill.

Appointment of Public Prosecutors.

This should, I think, rest with the local authorities, subject to the confirmation, if need be, of a Secretary of State. The appointment would be more efficiently made, in my opinion, by the local authorities, who would be better acquainted with the peculiarities and necessities of the various districts than any Secretary of State could possibly be; and from experience I fear, if the appointment rested with him, in time it would merge into being regarded as a reward for political services rendered to the party the then Government might belong to.

I may remark that in the definition of the persons qualified to act as public prosecutors mention is made of attorneys-at-law who are clerks to petty sessions. I am unaware that such an office exists; these gentlemen are clerks to justices sitting in petty sessions, who each individually can appoint their own clerk.

Expenses and Costs.

These, I think, throughout the country, should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund; but the public prosecutor's duties (he being compelled to be an attorney-at-law) should be restrained within such limits as would properly attach to him in consequence of his presumed legal attainments; and that, as at present, all payment of witnesses and expenses of trials be paid by the treasurers of the various local authorities on receiving certificates from the public prosecutor, the Treasury refunding such certified payments as he from time to time may make.

This arrangement would place a local and desirable control over the expenditure of the public prosecutor, in addition to that which the Treasury might exercise.

Commencement of Operation of Act.

I deeply regret that this is a permissive Bill.

Permissive Acts of Parliament appear to me always to be very unadvisable. They justly place the Legislature under an imputation of a desire to shirk the responsibility which constitutionally belongs to it, and hand it over to local authorities, leaving to the latter the odium, should any arise, of putting a tentative alteration of the law into operation. They create, as they have most unfortunately done in the Highway District Act, a diversity of practice in various parts of the country, adjacent areas being governed by different Acts of Parliament. Confusion is engendered in the public mind, and a feeling of dissension is created between the local authorities, who may have caused a permissive Act to be put in force, and those persons resident in the district who may justly, or not, consider they are suffering a hardship by being placed under Acts of Parliament the necessity of which they do not admit, and from the operations of which their neighbours are exempt from. A diversity of practice in our criminal courts is especially undesirable.

In conclusion I would remark, that it would much have facilitated the reading and understanding of the Bill had its language been more carefully considered, and the clauses following the natural course being arranged thus:—

1. Title of Bill.
2. Extent of Bill.
3. Commencement, date of.
4. Appointment of public prosecutors.
5. Duties of public prosecutors.
6. Expenses and costs.
7. Clerks and justices ditto.
8. Miscellaneous and interpretation clauses.
9. Schedules.

I have, &c.

FRANCIS DARWIN.

From MR. RODGERS.

Endcliffe Vale, Sheffield, 19th December 1872.

I HAVE perused and considered the Public Prosecutors Bill, 1872.

I think it meets every want.

I suggest two amendments.

Section 4, line 22.—I think that the law should be amended so as to prevent a coroner committing a prisoner for trial. A coroner's warrant should be for the apprehension of a prisoner and to convey him before a magistrate. The present practice

of taking depositions before the coroner and afterwards by the magistrates tends to the failure of justice; such depositions are necessarily taken in different phraseology, and some facts and circumstances are detailed in one set of depositions and omitted in the other. There is a danger that the coroner is not so careful as he should be, knowing that there will be another examination before the magistrates, and when the coroner has really committed a prisoner after a long hearing, and perhaps continued adjournments, the magistrates are unwilling to undertake the duty of a second investigation, which, under any circumstances, is only a ministerial duty of a useless nature, and the witnesses are irritated at their time being wasted because the coroner's commitment must remain.

Section 12. Payment of witnesses.—The public prosecutor ought to pay his witnesses before they leave court, as soon as the case is terminated, and in many instances it is necessary to advance money to witnesses to enable them to pay their travelling expenses before leaving home. I think therefore that a public prosecutor should have a large discretion on this matter, to act according to the wants of each particular case.

THOS. WM. RODGERS,
J.P. for the West Riding of Yorkshire.

From MR. CHAMBERS.

GENTLEMEN,

Clough House, Rotherham.

I HAVE carefully read the Public Prosecutors Bill, and approve of it, but would suggest the addition of the following words "as he may possess" after the words "information" in the 12th and 20th lines in the second page, both of them being in the fourth clause.

I would also suggest that after the word "salary," in the 12th line of the 7th page, the words "subject to future revision" be inserted.

I would further suggest that after the word "paid," in the 24th line of the 7th page, the following words be inserted, "but the salary so fixed shall not be a precedent for the amount of salary to be given to any future clerk of the peace."

The fourth clause seems to look forward to the clerk to the justices being in many cases appointed public prosecutor. Is that desirable, or is it considered that in some country places it may be considered necessary?

I am, &c.
JOHN CHAMBERS.

From MR. WOODE.

Conyngnam Hall, Knaresborough,
21st October 1872.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE looked over the "Public Prosecutors Bill," but do not see that there is any great necessity for a change in the present system. Where there is a failure in justice it is generally to be traced to the niggardly way in which Government cut down all expenses of prosecutions.

I quite approve of the payment of magistrates' clerks by salary instead of by fees.

I am, &c.
BASIL T. WOODE.

From MR. TINDAL.

SIR,

Aylesbury, 1st January 1873.

IN reply to your circular letter of the 16th September last, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the proceedings of the court of quarter sessions, which furnishes the opinion of the court upon this Bill as requested.

I am, &c.
ACTON TINDAL,
Clerk of the Peace for Berks.

BUCKS (TO WIT).—At the general quarter session of the peace of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, holden at Aylesbury, in and for the said county, on Monday in the first week after the twenty-eighth day of December, to wit, the thirtieth day of December, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, before the Most Noble Richard Grenville Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Francis Fremantle, Baronet, the Right Honourable William George Lord Chesham, and others, their fellows, Keepers of the Peace, and Justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to preserve the peace in the county aforesaid, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors done and committed in the said county, and so forth.

The report of the committee appointed by the court at the last quarter sessions of the peace for this county was presented to the court and read. It was thereupon resolved by the court that the same be approved and filed and entered on the records as follows :—

“ BUCKS (TO WIT).—To Her Majesty’s justices of the peace assembled at the general quarter sessions of the peace to be holden at Aylesbury, in and for the said county, on Monday the thirtieth day of December one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two.

“ The report of the committee appointed by the court at the Michaelmas Session, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, to consider the Bill brought into the House of Commons during the last Session of Parliament relating to the appointment of public prosecutors, together with a letter from the Secretary of State thereon, dated the sixteenth of September one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, seeking the opinion of the magistrates, and any suggestions which they might desire to make with regard to the provisions of the Bill.

“ Sheweth,—

“ That your committee met on the 26th instant, and the meeting was attended by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, the Right Honourable Sir Thomas Francis Fremantle, Baronet, William George Duncan, Esquire, Thomas Sands Chapman, Esquire, William Lowndes, Esquire, John Edward Bartlett, Esquire, George Henry Vansittart, Esquire, Reginald Robert Walpole, Esquire, Thomas Francis Fremantle, Esquire, Randolph Henry Crewe, Esquire, James Edward McConnell, Esquire, John Maddy Moore Hewett, Esquire, the Reverend Peter Thomas Ouvry, and the Reverend George Phillimore.

“ That it appeared to your committee that it is proposed by the Bill, as it now stands, to render it optional with counties to adopt the provisions of the measure, supposing the same were to become law.

“ Your committee, however, are unanimously of opinion that the county would not be prepared to adopt the proposed Bill, and that it is not necessary or desirable to place all criminal jurisdiction under the authority of a public officer; but at the same time your committee consider that in important cases involving serious offences, or in others which in the opinion of the committing magistrates may require much care and investigation in their preparation for trial, the existence of some public officer to whom the conduct of such cases could be entrusted would be attended with advantage.

“ BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS,
“ Chairman.”

And it was further resolved and ordered by the court, that the clerk of the peace do forward to the Secretary of State for the Home Department a copy of the order of this court, embracing a full copy of the report of the committee on this subject, by way of reply to his circular letter.

By the Court,
TINDAL.

FROM MR. KING MEADE-KING.

Walford, Taunton, 23rd December 1872.

My experience is limited to my own county (Somerset), for which I have been an active magistrate for 36 years, and, judging from that experience, I do not think a public prosecutor is required in rural districts. Since the establishment of the county

constabulary, I cannot recall to my recollection any case in which a failure of justice has occurred, where a different result may have been expected from the appointment of a public prosecutor. If such an officer be now appointed, I approve generally of the provisions of the Bill, subject to a few observations I have made in the margin.

R. KING MEADE-KING,
A Deputy Chairman of Quarter Sessions.

SECTION 3.

I think it should be the rule that all prosecutions for indictable offences should be "*instituted*," as at present, before magistrates by the parties aggrieved and that the "conduct" of such proceedings before magistrates by a public prosecutor should be the exception.

SECTION 4.

Third paragraph, line 16. After "shall" insert "forthwith."

SECTION 5.

Last paragraph. If the offender be committed for trial, whether he be subsequently convicted or not, the costs of the prosecution ought to be allowed to the prosecutor as at present.

Such payment seems to be recognised by section 12.

SECTION 6.

Line 9. Leave out "three" and insert "five."

SECTION 9.

Line 1. After "not" insert "within the division or district for which he so acts."

SECTION 12.

Line 1. After "shall" leave out "as soon as practicable after the" and insert "*immediately*" after the trial; and provision should be made for payment of these expenses accordingly.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

Offences.

Leave out lines 1 and 2 and insert "Any felony or offence punishable as felony."

From MR. NICHOLSON.

SIR, Sessions House, Clerkenwell, E.C.,
1st January 1873.

I BEG to enclose you the second opinion I have received on this Bill.

I am, &c.

RICH. W. NICHOLSON,
Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. GLOSSOP.

SIR, Silver Hall, Isleworth, 31st December 1872.

IN accordance with the request contained in your letter of the 27th September 1872, I beg to submit, for the consideration of Mr. Secretary Bruce, the following observations on the Public Prosecutors Bill.

As a whole, the Bill appears to be a step in the right direction, but so very large a margin is allowed to the Secretary of State in framing his regulations under the Act that it is difficult to form an opinion how it will work until such regulations can be perused.

Clause 4 provides that the clerk to the justices shall furnish certain particulars to the public prosecutor conducting the case before the justices. This gives rise to the question how he is to act if he happens to be both the clerk to the court and the public prosecutor conducting the case. It would appear that some definition of the duties of both offices is required when they are combined in the same person.

Clauses 17 and 18 contain excellent provisions as to the right of property of prosecutors.

Clause 21 appears to deal with the Central Criminal Court District in rather a summary manner. A portion of the county of Middlesex is situate within the Central Criminal Court District, but without the district of any police court, and there does not appear to be any good reason why the justices in such portion of the county should not have the power of recommending officers who are, in their opinion, fit for the office of public prosecutor.

The payment of the expenses of criminal prosecutions out of some fund to be provided by Parliament, instead of as at present out of the county rate, will be an act of justice to the county of Middlesex, in which a large proportion of the crime committed is the act of criminals gravitating to the metropolis from other districts.

I am, &c.

F. H. GLOSSOP,
Chairman of the Brentford Petty Sessions.

From MR. BULL.

SIR,

Oswestry, 31st December 1872.

As requested by your circular of the 16th of September last, numbered as in margin (8002), I forwarded copies of the Public Prosecutors Bill, accompanying same to such of the magistrates of this borough as usually attend quarter sessions, with a request that they would favour Mr. Secretary Bruce, through me, with their opinions and any suggestions thereon, and I beg to enclose a copy of the only written opinion I have received.

I have, however, heard the verbal opinions of several to the effect that they do not consider such an appointment necessary, and that, if made, it will tend to throw the conduct of all prosecutions in a locality into the hands of one attorney, which they consider highly objectionable.

I am, &c.

J. BULL,
Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. BARNES.

DEAR SIR, Brookside, Gwilk, near Ruabon,
24th December 1872.

I HAVE looked through the Public Prosecutors Bill, and have only one or two remarks to make upon it.

In section 4, I do not think that the clerk to the justices ought ever to be the public prosecutor. He is the justices' adviser upon matters of law, and the public have an impression that the justices are naturally favourable to anything undertaken or remarks made by him.

I feel strongly that clerks to justices ought not to undertake any prosecution where the case has to be tried by their own bench of magistrates. There ought not to be the least ground for suspicion on the part of the public that the judgment or sentence of the court has been in any case in the slightest degree biassed.

I think the Bill, as a whole, is a very good one, and likely to serve a good purpose.

I remain, &c.

JAS. R. BARNES.

From LORD BELPER.

SIR,

Kingston, Derby, 2nd January 1873.

WITH reference to your letters of the 15th of August and the 30th of September last, on the subject of the Public Prosecutors Bill, I have the honour to inform you that I brought the subject before the magistrates who attended the quarter sessions held at Nottingham yesterday, and in compliance with your desire I requested their opinion respecting the Bill.

The magistrates present instructed me to inform you, in reply to your letter, that, having regard to their own experience, they have no reason to be dissatisfied with the working of the present system, and have no reason to desire any alteration of the law. But, in communicating this reply to your inquiries, they desired me to add that they

had no intention to express any opinion as to the working of the present system in other places, where the circumstances may be very different from those under which their own experience has been formed.

I have, &c.
BELPER.

From MR. TWEMLOW.

SIR, Betley Court, Crewe, 3rd January 1873.

IN compliance with your letter, dated September 30th, 1872, and addressed to me as chairman of the quarter sessions for the county of Stafford, I directed the attention of the justices present at the sessions to the Bill relating to public prosecutors, &c. The justices, however, did not pass any resolution on the subject. In saying that I see no practical objection to the proposed scheme for public prosecutors, I must be understood as expressing my own individual opinion only. As to paying justices' clerks by salary, I would venture to impress upon you the desirability of inserting a clause directing and enabling the courts of quarter sessions to divide their several counties into petty sessional divisions, for each of which divisions one clerk only should be appointed; the appointment to be vested in the justices attending each petty sessional division. This would limit the number of clerks, and prevent individual justices appointing (as they now may) their own separate clerks. These petty sessional clerks should be paid by salary, the salary of each to be fixed by the quarter sessions. In fixing the amount of the salaries it should not be incumbent upon the sessions to pay any regard to the fees received by the existing clerks. I rather think that at the time Sir John Jervis carried through Parliament the Statutes known by his name, in the year 1848, he had a Bill prepared for such division of counties into petty sessional divisions, which Bill was not proceeded with. On more than one occasion attempts have been made to pay the justices' clerks in this county by salary, but their demands have been so large, nothing has been done.

I have, &c.
THOS. T. TWEMLOW.

From MR. MERRIMAN.

Office of the Clerk of the Peace for Wilts,
Marlborough, 3rd January 1873.

SIR, I HAVE the honour to send you the report of a committee of magistrates which was presented to the quarter sessions on the subject of this Bill.

I have, &c.
WM. C. MERRIMAN,
Clerk of the Peace of the County of Wilts.

Town Hall, Chippenham, 6th December 1872.

WILTS HILARY SESSIONS, 1872-3.

REPORT of the Committee appointed at the Michaelmas Sessions, 1872, to consider a communication from the Secretary of State, accompanied by print of a Bill for the appointment of Public Prosecutors.

The committee report to the court that they consider that it would be desirable to provide for the appointment of a public prosecutor for the Metropolitan or Central Criminal Court District, and for other large and populous localities, but that it would be expedient that the effect and working of the system should be tried before any appointment of public prosecutors takes place for the country generally.

In the event of the system working satisfactorily, and being extended to the country, then the committee consider it essential that a local character should be given to the measure by the appointment of the clerk of each petty sessional division to act as public prosecutor for his district, if approved and recommended by the magistrates.

But the measure, if adopted, should contain express provisions for payment by the Imperial Treasury of the costs and expenses of carrying it into effect, both in regard to the institution and conduct of prosecutions, so as not to entail any additional burden upon the county or borough rates.

The committee are further of opinion that excessive powers are given, under the provisions of the Bill, to the Secretary of State.

(Signed)

HENRY ALWORTH MEREWETHER,

Chairman.

From MR. PHILLIPS.

SIR, Guildhall, Plymouth, 3rd January 1873.

IN accordance with your circular letter of 16th September last, I am instructed by the justices of the borough of Plymouth to forward to you the following observations and suggestions on this Bill.

Section 5. Proviso.—Where prosecutor does not take up or initiate a prosecution, he may be compelled to do so by application and order of two justices of jurisdiction, or on appeal from them to a judge in chambers.

Section 7.—All reference to the town council (local authority) as to appointment of public prosecutor should be struck out of the Bill, and the clause (20) giving the option of adoption of Act omitted; otherwise the Act will remain a dead letter in most towns.

Section 8.—Provision should be made for payment of a deputy, not out of public prosecutor's salary, unless Secretary of State thinks public prosecutor should have personally attended to the matter.

Section 10.—Public prosecutor should have power under certain rules to expend moneys in making inquiries, and otherwise in reference to the getting up a case, both before prisoner apprehended and after. It is necessary in many cases to send constables to a distance, or employ persons at a distance, to make inquiries, and see and examine persons. It would be well to require public prosecutors in all towns to perform these duties for each other as part of their ordinary duties, but sometimes this might be impossible. If a public prosecutor in a distant town is required by another public prosecutor to assist him in a case by causing inquiries or search to be made, the agent public prosecutor should have power to call on the justices on his sworn information to assist and direct searches by the agent's local constables. Much agency and travelling expenses may thus be saved.

It will be impossible to conduct public prosecutions unless some extra expenses are allowed at times.

The salary should be fixed in proportion to population (floating and stationary).

Section 13.—In case the town council and justices differ as to amount of salary of clerk to justices, Secretary of State should have power to fix amount at a sum not exceeding the highest salary named by either party. In the case of Plymouth there was a great difficulty in coming to an agreement on the amount of salary.

The clerk to justices should be allowed to pay necessary expenses attendant on the performance of their duties by justices and their clerk, and deduct same from fees received by him, such expenses to be passed by justices at a quarterly gaol sessions.

Section 14, proviso 5.—A clerk should be liable to a penalty only for "wilfully," knowingly, and improperly taking a fee not authorised by the table of fees. There may be two opinions whether a fee is payable or not, and mistakes may be made *bonâ fide*.

The revision of tables of fees should be permissive, not imperative.

I am, &c.

W. PHILLIPS,

Clerk to the Justices.

From MR. BROCKMAN.

SIR, Folkestone, 4th January 1873.

ADVERTING to your circular letter of the 16th September last, requesting to be favoured, through me, with the opinions of such of our local magistrates as take

an active part in attending quarter sessions upon the Bill, I beg to enclose you the opinion of Mr. R. W. Boarer, J.P., on the Bill, being the only one I have received from our borough justices.

I am, &c.

RALPH THOS. BROCKMAN,
Clerk of the Peace, per A. M.

From MR. BOARER.

DEAR SIR, Folkestone, 12th December 1872.

WITH reference to the Public Prosecutors Bill, a copy of which you sent me on the 30th September last, with a request that I would give an opinion thereon, I beg now to inform you—

- 1st. That I am favourable to the appointment of a public prosecutor, and that I do not disapprove of the Bill as drawn, except—
- 2nd. That I disapprove of a clerk to the magistrates or a clerk of the peace being also a public prosecutor.

I am, &c.

R. W. BOARER.

From MR. HAYWARD.

SIR, County Hall, Gloucester, 6th January 1873.

I HAVE the honour to report that in compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 15th of August last, I brought the subject of the amended Public Prosecutors Bill before the magistrates of this county assembled at the Michaelmas quarter sessions, who after some discussion referred it to a committee consisting of 13 magistrates who had taken an interest in the public prosecutors' question, and who entertained various and varying opinions upon the subject, and with difficulty agreed to a printed report, which I enclose. This report was presented to the last Epiphany quarter sessions, and the magistrates then present again discussed the subject, and ultimately rejected the report by a division of 13 to 12, without coming to any further resolution.

I have, &c.

HUNTER HAYWARD,
Chairman.

From MR. RIDDIFORD.

Shire Hall, Gloucester, 18th November 1872.

THE committee appointed by the last Michaelmas court of quarter sessions having met and considered the amended Public Prosecutors Bill, as submitted for the opinion of the magistrates of this county by Mr. Secretary Bruce, report—

That it is in principle desirable that there shall be a public officer, whose duty it shall be to carry on the prosecution of offences to the relief of private individuals;

That the superintendent of police in each petty sessional division would be the most convenient public prosecutor, and that he should be entitled to the legal assistance and advice of the magistrates' clerk wherein requisite;

That the costs of prosecutions having been taxed by some independent person, such as the clerk of assize, should be paid directly, out of moneys provided by Parliament, in the manner suggested by this Bill; but that such mode of repayment should not be made contingent upon the appointment of a public prosecutor;

And that the Bill, so far as it is inconsistent with the above report, is not satisfactory.

Ordered, that the above be printed and circulated among the justices of the county, with an epitome of the Bill, as follows:—

PUBLIC PROSECUTORS BILL, 1872.

The substance of this Bill as amended in committee, so far as relates to counties proper, is as follows:—

Public prosecutors are to be appointed, whose duty will be to prosecute persons committed for trial for any of the offences mentioned in Schedule 1, viz., all felonies and certain misdemeanors, and any others that may be ordered.

A Secretary of State may, from time to time, alter any regulations in the Bill, determine what proceedings shall be taken by the public prosecutor, define his duties, and control him generally.

The public prosecutor may be either the clerk to the justices or an attorney of three years' practice, residing in any part of the county, and he may institute or conduct proceedings before the justices.

When the justices' clerk is not himself the public prosecutor, he must transmit the original depositions, &c. to the public prosecutor, who is to deliver them to the proper officer of the court in which the trial is to be had.

All such prosecutions are to be conducted solely by the public prosecutor, except that anyone may, by order of a Secretary of State, be associated with him in a prosecution; and anyone may become a voluntary prosecutor, or may apply to one of the superior courts to be substituted for the public prosecutor, in any case in which he is dissatisfied with the mode of proceeding.

A Secretary of State, with the consent of the Treasury, is to fix the number of public prosecutors for each county, who are to be appointed by and to hold office during the pleasure of any Secretary of State.

The local authority, viz., the court of quarter sessions, may recommend persons for the appointment, but the Secretary of State need not regard any such recommendation, and may appoint any qualified person that he may think fit, either without or in opposition to such recommendation.

This would evidently put very extensive patronage into the hands of a Secretary of State without any effectual control or authority in the justices.

A public prosecutor may appoint qualified deputies without any restriction, but he himself must not, directly or indirectly, be concerned professionally in any criminal proceedings, or in the registration of voters or parliamentary elections.

He is to be paid by a salary, and to have in addition all costs properly incurred by him in the execution of his duties; the salaries of public prosecutors and their taxed costs, together with the expenses and compensation for loss of time of private prosecutors and witnesses, are to be paid out of a fund to be provided by Parliament for the purpose.

Clerks of the peace and justices' clerks are to be paid by salary, the amount of which is to be ascertained, at least so far as relates to clerks of the peace, upon the average of three years' profits, and such salary is to include all business which may be done by such clerk.

A table of fees is to be settled by the Secretary of State, which are to be paid accordingly.

The machinery of the Bill, as above epitomized, seems to be inconveniently cumbrous, inefficient, and defective.

GEO. RIDDIFORD,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. BAILEY.

SIR,

6th January 1873.

I AM directed, in compliance with the request contained in your circular letter of the 16th of September last (8002), to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a resolution passed by the justices of Norwich at their last gaol sessions, embodying their opinion on the provisions of the above Bill.

I am, &c.
E. C. BAILEY,
Clerk of the Peace.

Norwich, 31st December 1872.

At a quarterly sessions of the justices of the city of Norwich, and county of the same city, held at the Guildhall, in and for the same city, on Tuesday the thirty-first day of December, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria,

by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith.

Before Edward Kerrison Harvey, Esq. (Chairman),
 Abel Towler, Esq.,
 Frederick Brown, Esq.,
 Robert Fitch, Esq.,
 Jeremiah James Colman, Esq. M.P.,
 Augustus Frederick Coke Bolingbroke, Esq.,
 Simms Reeve, Esq., and
 William Peter Nichols, Esq.,

Justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen, in the said city, and county of the same city, and also, and so forth.

A report of the committee of magistrates appointed at the last gaol sessions to consider the provisions of a Bill intended to be introduced into the next Session of Parliament, "for the appointment of a public prosecutor and better administration of justice," having been presented and read,

It was resolved, that the following communication be made to the Secretary of State, in reply to his circular letter of the 16th of September last, on the subject of the above Bill, viz:—

That the magistrates have considered the provisions of the Bill, and that the only alterations which they think are required in it are in sections 9 and 13.

In section 9 they recommend that the person appointed public prosecutor should, in addition to the restrictions thereby imposed upon him from being employed or concerned as attorney in any criminal proceeding, or as attorney or agent in matters connected with the registration of parliamentary voters, or as agent for a candidate, or in any manner interfering at a parliamentary election, be restricted from acting as attorney or agent in matters connected with the registration of voters at an election of councillor under the Municipal Corporation Acts, or in any manner, directly or indirectly, interfering in any election of such councillor otherwise than by acting as returning officer or voting at such election.

That in section 13 the salary of the clerk to the justices should be fixed in the same manner as in the proviso to this section is provided with respect to the salary of the clerk of the peace.

That in other respects the magistrates approve of the provisions of the Bill.

By the Court.

BAILEY,
 Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. WILLIAMS.

SIR, Treffos, Menai Bridge, 8th January 1873.

WITH reference to your letters on the subject of a Bill to authorize the appointment of public prosecutors, I beg to inform you that I brought the subject before an unusually full bench of the justices of Anglesey at the Hilary quarter sessions for this county, and I have to report to you their unanimous dissent to any such Bill.

I am, &c.

J. WILLIAMS,
 Chairman.

From MR. JONES.

City Clerk of the Peace's Office, Gloucester,
 9th January 1873.

SIR, ENCLOSED I have the honour to forward you a copy of the minutes of yesterday's proceedings at the City of Gloucester Epiphany Sessions in connection with this Bill.

I have, &c.

FRANCIS W. JONES,
 Clerk of the Peace.

CITY OF GLOUCESTER EPIPHANY SESSIONS, 1873.

Proposed Public Prosecutors Bill.

(Copy Minutes.)

The Secretary of State for the Home Department having forwarded to the clerk of the peace, for distribution amongst the justices of the peace for this city and county, several copies of this Bill, "for the appointment of a public prosecutor and better administration of justice," as amended in committee in the parliamentary session of 1872 (and prepared and brought in by Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Eykyn, Mr. Vernon Harcourt, and Mr. Rathbone), and proposed to be re-introduced by the Government in the forthcoming Session of 1873, and such justices having considered the same individually, and also having further considered and discussed the same at these sessions, the following resolutions were passed, and it was

Ordered, that the same be inserted in the minutes of the proceedings of this court, and that the clerk of the peace do forward a copy thereof to the Secretary of State for the Home Department.

(Copy Resolutions.)

The magistrates assembled at the Epiphany court of quarter sessions of the peace for the city and county of the city of Gloucester having met this 8th day of January 1873, and considered the amended "Public Prosecutors Bill" as submitted for their opinion by Mr. Secretary Bruce,—

Resolved, that in the opinion of this court it is not desirable that the provisions of the "Public Prosecutors Bill, 1872," be extended beyond the limits of the Central Criminal Court. Provision might be made for the public prosecutor to act in the county upon the requisition of two-thirds of the magistrates of a petty sessional division, or of a city or borough, in any special or extraordinary case, should such arise ;

Also, that the costs of prosecutions having been taxed in the locality by some independent officer, such as the clerk of assize or clerk of the peace, should be paid directly out of moneys provided by Parliament in the manner suggested by the Bill, and that the system of re-taxation by Treasury officers, without any opportunity of ascertaining the particular circumstances of each case, be discontinued; but that such mode of repayment should not be made contingent upon the appointment of a public prosecutor;

And that the Bill, so far as it is inconsistent with the above resolutions, is not satisfactory.

By the Court.

FRANCIS W. JONES.

Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. KENNETT.

SIR, and the all-abled Ynglingar Guildhall, Norwich, 9th January 1873.

I TAKE the liberty to send to you a few observations on this Bill.

I beg to suggest that the whole cost of administration of justice throughout the country should be paid by the Treasury. This would be accomplished by the provisions of the present Bill with the slight addition that justices' clerks should account to the Government in the same manner as registrars of County Courts now do for all fees received by them (or the fees could be collected by stamps), and that the clerks' salaries should be paid by the Treasury. In some boroughs a revenue is made out of justices' clerks' fees and applied in reduction of the local rates; whilst in other places some of these fees become a charge on the Borough Fund. It appears to me to be wrong in principle that persons seeking justice for the public good, and who are probably large ratepayers, should be compelled to contribute further to the local rates by paying higher fees than are necessary for the administration of the law, and for the sole purpose of increasing the local revenue. This plan of dealing with justices' clerks' fees and salaries would accomplish two objects: 1st. It would conform to the recent resolution of the House of Commons for the relief of local burthens; 2nd. It would enable the Government, in carrying out the recommendations of the Judicature Commissioners upon the future management of the County Courts, to utilize the services of justices' clerks in issuing summonses, &c. in places where it is proposed to abolish the office of Registrar of County Courts.

I send by this post a copy of the Bill containing some suggested alterations, amongst which will be found the following :—

Section 13.—In the proviso to this section (line 17) I have inserted the words “or clerk to the justices.” Probably these words were not intentionally omitted from the Bill, but I suggest that those words, and “that such clerk shall hold his office during good behaviour,” should be inserted to prevent injustice to the present clerks, who might otherwise be removed from their present offices in case the Secretary of State should fix salaries not agreeable to the town councils.

Section 14, sub-section 5.—I suggest that the word “knowingly” should be placed before the word “take” in this section, to prevent a clerk, under pressure of business in a court, becoming liable to a penalty of 20*l.* by inadvertent accident, and from which he could not derive any personal benefit. No penalty would attach to the clerk for taking a less fee than that allowed.

Sections 15*a*, 15*b*, 15*c*.—These additional sections would be found very useful.

Schedule 3.—Section 120 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96. relates to procedure only. Probably section 121 of the same statute is intended.

24 & 25 Vict. c. 75., s. 5., appears to have been omitted from the Schedule 3, but I submit, for your consideration, that it is important to repeal those parts of it which I have set out in the copy Bill sent herewith.

I am, &c.

GEO. B. KENNETT,

Clerk to the Justices of the City of Norwich.

SECTION 13.

Paragraph 3, line 2. After “peace” insert “or clerk to the justices.”

Line 8. After “paid” insert “and that such clerk shall hold his office during good behaviour.”

SECTION 14.

Sub-section 5, line 12. After “person” insert “shall knowingly.”

INSERT SECTION 15A.

Any justice or clerk to justices may refuse to do any act for which a fee may be demandable, unless such fee shall be first paid, as well as the fee payable to any constable or other person for the service of any summons, or the execution of any warrant, or otherwise in relation to such act; and any justice may order the clerk to the justices to do any such act where the complainant is from poverty unable to pay such fee.

INSERT SECTION 15B.

Whenever the person who shall be liable to pay any fees to any clerk to justices whatever (whether he be paid by salary or not) shall fail to make payment thereof, any justice of the sessional division, place, or district, or part of a division, for which such clerk acts (after a summons to such person issued on the complaint of such clerk and upon proof alone that the business or act for which the fees are claimed has been done or performed) may at any time after such fees become payable adjudge that such fees shall be paid to such clerk at such time as such justice shall determine, and the amount thereof shall be enforced in like manner as any order of justices may be enforced under section 26 of 11 & 12 Vict. c. 43.

[At present these fees can be recovered in the County Courts only.]

INSERT SECTION 15C.

Every clerk to whom the Act applies may, with the approval of the justice in petty sessions, appoint some competent person as his deputy to act for him temporarily during illness or unavoidable absence, and any such deputy shall have all the powers and perform all the duties of such clerk during such illness or absence as aforesaid.

SECTION 20.

I suggest that the Act should come into force without adoption by local authority.

SCHEDULE 3.

After “20 & 21 Vict. c. 43.” insert—

24 & 25 Vict. c. 75. - An Act for amending the Municipal Corporations Act.

So much of section five as provides that it shall not be lawful for the clerk to the justices of any borough, by himself or his partner, or otherwise, to be directly or indirectly employed or interested in the prosecution of any offender committed for trial by the justices of such borough, or any of them, at any court of gaol delivery or general or quarter sessions.

In recital of Act of 1861, column 3, after “twenty” insert “one.”

From MR. DONNITHORN.

SIR,

Fareham, Hants, 9th January 1873.

I HAVE the honour to hand you herewith some observations by Captain Field, R.N., one of the magistrates for this county, acting in the division of Fareham, on the "Public Prosecutors" Bill, and received by me this morning.

I am, &c.

NICHOLAS DONNITHORN,
Clerk to the Justices.

From CAPTAIN E. FIELD, R.N.

Clause 13.—Payment of Magistrates' Clerks by Salary in lieu of Fees.

I shall rejoice to see this proposal become law, but the subject has *not* been properly considered in all its bearings, judging by the clause as it stands.

In populous neighbourhoods, as, for instance, Gosport, where petty sessions are held *twice* a week, and a county magistrate must attend daily, payment of the clerk by salary can readily be arranged under the clause, but in the case of *rural districts*, where petty sessions are frequently only held *monthly*, and where a magistrate only attends when required, and that but rarely (there are *hundreds* of such places), the payment of the clerk by salary would be a great mistake. The salary would be so small that it would be an insult to a respectable professional man to offer it to him as appertaining to the appointment; whereas at present a respectable solicitor accepts the post in such country districts more as an *honorary one*, which gives him to a certain extent a better status amongst his professional brethren, and the fees are quite a secondary consideration. If, however, a salary is fixed it would be looked upon by the public as *a measure* of the man's ability, or the amount of duty to be performed, and gentlemen would be more inclined to decline the post than seek it. At present the public know *nothing* as to the amount of fees received by clerks so circumstanced.

The objection I have raised can be met by giving quarter sessions discretionary power to recommend that in certain exceptional cases the clerks be paid by fees and not by salary.

Of course one uniform table of fees should prevail all over the country.

Clerks to magistrates ought to be positively *prohibited* by law, *under penalties*, from acting as attorney for a client in any case that is to come before the Bench to which he is clerk. How can he advise the Bench impartially when he has a personal interest in the case?

I know such conduct is not unfrequent in country districts. I could name a *most glaring* case in point within my own knowledge.

I think it would be well to constitute all clerks to magistrates deputy prosecutors by virtue of their office, *irrespective* of their being qualified attorneys. They really act now as prosecutors virtually when the Bench is sitting.

I would rather *not* give the public prosecutor the right of nominating the deputies.

At Gosport the clerk is not a qualified attorney, but I imagine there are few men in Hampshire who have a better knowledge of the proper mode of conducting business in magisterial courts. He has served over 20 years under a magistrate's clerk, and is now clerk himself. More business is done at Gosport than elsewhere at petty sessions in the county.

The clerk at the Mansion House also is not a qualified attorney, and I presume no one would say he ought not to be a "deputy prosecutor."

I am, &c.

E. FIELD, Captain R.N.,
Justice of the Peace, County Hants.

From MR. MAULE.

SIR,

Huntingdon, 10th January 1873.

I HAVE the honour to forward herewith the opinion of the chairman of quarter sessions, as well as the chairmen of the petty sessional divisions of Leightonstone, Forsland, and Hurstingstone on this Bill.

I have, &c.

EDWD. MAULE,
Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. DUNCOMBE.

DEAR SIR,

Wavesley Park, St. Neot's,
26th December 1872.

I now beg to submit, for the information of the Home Secretary, the opinion I have formed, after consideration, of the Public Prosecutors Bill of last Session as amended in committee.

Although in some few instances there may be a failure of justice occasioned by the want of a public prosecutor, these instances are rare in rural districts.

I am in favour generally of the principle of such a measure, but should much prefer to see it applied in the first instance to the metropolitan and manufacturing counties. If successful there it might be extended to the rural districts of England.

I remain, &c.

O. DUNCOMBE,
Chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions,
County of Huntingdon.

From MESSRS. GREENE AND MELLOR.

DEAR SIR,

St. Ives, 23rd December 1872.

WE have laid this Bill before the magistrates acting for the divisions for which we are clerks in accordance with your request. None of the magistrates have expressed an opinion that the Bill would be of use in becoming an Act, nor that it is at all desirable that it should be adopted in this county. On the other side we send an opinion written by the chairman of this Bench.

We are, &c.

GREENE AND MELLOR.

From MR. SPERLING.

SUCH a functionary as a public prosecutor is not, in my opinion, desirable in counties. I deprecate the restriction imposed by section 9 upon clerks of petty sessions, who are, in my opinion, highly proper persons to conduct prosecutions. My experience as chairman of St. Ives and Caxton Divisions leads me to this conclusion. I have never known of any abuse in their conduct of prosecutions, nor in advising, for their own purposes, that any prisoner or person charged should be committed for trial.

It might be advisable to empower justices' clerks to prosecute in all cases in the absence of the prosecutor, or when he is unwilling, and it is thought right that a prosecution should be instituted.

Or in some cases the police might be ordered to prosecute, and the prosecutor be called as a witness.

For particular and very exceptional cases resort might be had by clerks of petty sessions to the advice of some special expert in criminal cases appointed for that purpose.

The cost to the country of carrying out this Bill would be very great and, except perhaps in the metropolis, needless.

A. SPERLING.

From MR. HUMBLEY.

DEAR SIR,

St. Neot's, 9th January 1873.

IN respect to this Bill I may say that I have carefully considered its clauses and its probable bearing, if passed into law, on the criminal statistics of this county. My opinion (and my brother justices of this division agree with me) is that the Bill is totally uncalled for in this and the adjoining agricultural counties. During the 20 years I have sat on this Bench I cannot recall to mind a single instance where a public prosecutor could have done more than our clerk and the police together have done. What is to prevent the justices' clerks, gentlemen appointed to the office from their acknowledged respectability and standing in their respective counties, as well as on account of their legal ability and acumen, from conducting prosecutions if the police do not?

Residing as they do on the spot, and acquainted with the neighbourhood and general character of the people in their several divisions, they are eminently capable

of doing so. I would suggest that the Bill be tried, at any rate in the first instance, in the large manufacturing counties, where it may be of service. Here we require no public officer to divide the responsibility with our present officials, or to add to our rates without an appreciable advantage. The state of crime in this county is satisfactory at present, and a public prosecutor would not be likely to make it more so.

Believe me, &c.

W. W. W. HUMBLEY.

From MR. TILLARD.

THE magistrates of the Leightonstone Division, in the county of Huntingdon, assembled at a petty sessions held this 4th day of January 1873, desire to express an opinion that the advantages to be derived from the Bill are by no means commensurate with the very heavy expense to be entailed on the country.

The magistrates are of opinion that the clerks of petty sessions are the most proper persons to conduct prosecutions, being necessarily acquainted with all the details of the case, and that their character and position is such that their advice may be safely followed without reference to their own interests.

The magistrates agree generally with the principles of the Bill as regards the substitution of salaries for fees.

PHILIP TILLARD,

Chairman,

From MR. LOVELL.

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Wells, Somerset,

SIR,

13th January 1873.

I HAVE the honour to send you the opinion of Sir E. Strachey, Bart., which I have only received this morning; and I also enclose you a resolution of the court of quarter sessions adopted on the 31st ultimo.

I have, &c.

EDWIN LOVELL,

Clerk of the Peace.

From SIR E. STRACHEY, Bart.

Sutton Court, 11th January 1873.

THE several justices of the county of Somerset having been requested by a circular from the Home Office to send, through their clerk of the peace, their opinions on the Public Prosecutors Bill, I beg to submit the following observations.

It is desirable to abolish the useless forms of binding over private persons to prosecute, and to make new regulations as proposed by section 3 of the Bill.

In this county it is the practice for each justices' clerk to act as public prosecutor for the cases sent for trial from the division in which he acts, and if he omits to do so he is considered to have neglected his duty, and to have risked a miscarriage of justice.

The justices' clerks are attorneys of the highest professional standing in the county. It is doubtful whether gentlemen of equal standing would undertake the office of public prosecutor unless in conjunction with that of justices' clerk.

The remuneration for conducting the great majority of cases sent for trial is so small that they would not be worth the attention of an attorney of high standing unless he is also a justices' clerk. As such clerk to the committing magistrates he has already taken the depositions, and is personally acquainted with the details of the case, and he can continue to conduct the prosecution at a less cost than would be possible if it were entrusted to any other attorney. The details of information which are already in his possession are evidently available to him as they are not to any other prosecutor, a stranger in the case to whom they must be communicated in writing, and to whom in all those small cases, which are the great majority, they would certainly be communicated in the most imperfect manner.

I think, therefore, that each justices' clerk should be made a public prosecutor within his own division, for the purposes, and with the duties, proposed by the Bill.

But as there may be cases in which special professional skill is required, I think some provision should be made by which the Home Office, on the application of the committing justices, or of its own authority, might appoint its own attorney as public prosecutor in any such case.

The appointment of *all* justices' clerks as public prosecutors would supersede the provisions of sections 6 and 7; but I would observe that those provisions are in themselves questionable. The necessity for efficient legal assistance to the justices of every petty sessional division is so immediate that they may be trusted to appoint the best man they can find; but a nomination of three candidates from which the Home Secretary is to select one, and that nomination made by a large body like the court of quarter sessions, would involve a responsibility so divided, remote, and contingent as to be practically none. Great pressure, personal or political, would be put upon every justice to support candidates irrespective of any personal fitness; and then the like process would be repeated to induce the county members, or the county leaders of opposition, to influence the Home Secretary in his final selection. If it should be decided that the public prosecutors shall not be the whole of the justices' clerks, but only a small number of them, I think it would be better to give the direct appointments to the court of quarter sessions, subject to the veto of the Home Secretary.

In section 13 of the proposed Bill I would include the "Local Stamp Act, 1869," with the "Criminal Justice Act, 1851;" and it would be better to make them at once compulsory, instead of only as a consequence of the voluntary acceptance of the Act of the local authority.

E. STRACHEY.

From MR. LOVELL.

SOMERSET (to wit).—At the general quarter sessions of the peace of our Lady the Queen, held at the Shire Hall, at Taunton, in and for the county of Somerset, on Tuesday, the thirty-first day of December, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, before Richard Horner Paget, Esquire, chairman, Richard King Meade King, Theodore Thring, and Thomas Englesby Rogers, Esquires, deputy chairmen, and others, their companions, justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen, in and for the county of Somerset aforesaid, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors committed in the same county.

It is resolved—That whilst this court approves of the appointment of public prosecutors it is not prepared to accept the Public Prosecutors Bill in its present shape.

By the Court.

LOVELL, J.

Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. FFOOKS.

SIR, Clerk of the Peace Office, Sherborne,
13th January 1873.

I BEG to forward to you herewith a copy of some observations made by a few of the magistrates of this county upon the Public Prosecutors Bill.

I have, &c.

THOMAS FFOOKS,

Clerk of the Peace.

The following MAGISTRATES for DORSETSHIRE have addressed the Clerk of the Peace upon the subject of this Bill, as follows:—

LORD PORTMAN, Chairman of Quarter Sessions, says:—

My opinion as to the Public Prosecutors Bill is that is wholly unnecessary for this county.

It may be well to try the plan in the Metropolis, Central Criminal Court District, or in some populous places.

If the plan had been to abolish the office of coroner, and to substitute a public prosecutor for each county of the size of Dorset, I should hail the change with satisfaction.

I consider the office of coroner a wholly useless expense.

JOSEPH GUNDRY, Esq., says :—

Section 3, I see, requires public prosecutors to conduct prosecution of persons committed for trial for offences in Schedule 1 of the Bill, and such other prosecutions as may be directed by the Secretary of State. Now, it appears to me, that the duties of the public prosecutor should commence at an earlier stage than this. He should be obliged to take the initiative, and institute proceedings to bring the accused before the magistrates where a crime has been committed, and no private person is disposed to prosecute effectually. At present this is left pretty much to the police, and a miscarriage of justice is too often the consequence. For the ends of justice it is quite as important that a case should be investigated carefully and skilfully, and the proper evidence considered and shaped for the preliminary inquiry before a magistrate as for the trial. A mess is often made of a case between the discovery of the commission of a crime and the bringing the suspected person before a magistrate. Now it is at this stage that the public are frequently at fault, and the want of an experienced public prosecutor felt.

Section 9 prohibits a public prosecutor acting as agent for a candidate at a parliamentary election. This appears to me a totally unnecessary restriction. If such employment is to disqualify, many employments would equally do so. The two offices are not likely to clash in any way, nor could the public prosecutor use his office now-a-days to further a candidate's interest, the more especially since the introduction of the ballot. The restriction is unnecessary, and would probably prevent many competent persons accepting the appointment. I think the simple and efficacious way would be to appoint the clerks to justices in the various divisions of counties and in boroughs (where they would consent to act, and where they would not, some other competent person) to discharge the duties of public prosecutor, the clerks or other persons being held responsible for the due discharge of all the duties of the office. The remuneration need not be high, merely enough to cover out-of-pocket expenses, and a small sum a year in proportion to the time and attention which may be required in each district. The amount of such remuneration may be ascertained on inquiry as to what has been the extent of cases during, say, two or three years previously, and, if necessary, this remuneration could be re-adjusted from time to time, on its appearing desirable that there shall be an increase or reduction. I believe this plan would effect all that is sought for, and prove much more economical than it would be to appoint one, two, or three officials for a county; and the above plan would ensure a greater amount of local knowledge and the immediate presence of the officer in the particular district.

Sections 13, 14, 15.—With regard to the payment of justices' clerks by fees, it is, perhaps, advisable that this question should be settled by a salary instead of by fees, or partly by salary and partly by fees; but some care is required in determining the principle upon which the salary is to be fixed, or there will be considerable difficulties cropping up hereafter; *e.g.*, it ought not to be competent for a town council to fix a low salary and make a considerable profit out of the fees paid by the public as justices' clerks fees under the scale in force. I believe in some places this occurs. In such cases the clerks do not receive a fair remuneration, whilst the public have to pay the fees just the same. The fees payable for magisterial business should not be in excess more than can possibly be helped of the remuneration paid to the clerk by way of salary. If fees are received as clerks' fees they should be so appropriated, and not to other purposes. This would require attention when the table of fees and the clerks' salaries were under consideration. Harmony between the table of fees and the salary should exist, and fair remuneration for the business to be transacted should be allowed.

The payment of clerks by salary instead of fees would remove all possible grounds for suspicion that they were actuated in any way either as clerks or public prosecutors by self-interest in any proceeding which they may think fit to institute.

JOHN GOODDEN, Esq., says :—

The number of public prosecutors is a question of some importance.

If many are appointed, probably the office would be scarcely worth taking. It would be necessary that the appointment should be in the hands of thoroughly efficient men.

If a public prosecutor be appointed, I have no doubt many cases would be brought to light which now, through the fear of expense and trouble, are allowed to fall through.

If it were possible (without interfering with the jury system) to allow the public prosecutor to attend before the grand jury and give an outline of the case, and what each witness was expected to prove, perhaps much good may arise, and would prevent the grand jury from *trying* the case, instead of ascertaining if there is a *prima facie* case to put the party charged on his trial.

If, however, the Bill becomes law, and is found to work well, it is not unlikely that grand juries would soon cease to exist; for the preliminary inquiry before the justice and the prosecution being by a paid public officer, any further investigation would be almost unnecessary before putting an offender on his trial.

From MR. FOSTER.

The Shirehouse, Norwich,
13th January 1873.

SIR,

REFERRING to your letter of the 15th August last, with regard to a Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, addressed to the chairman of quarter sessions for this county, and to my reply to the above, dated the 28th October last, I now beg to inform you that the Bill was laid before the court of quarter sessions held for this county, at Norwich, on the 1st January instant, and that the court unanimously adopted the following resolution with regard to the Bill, viz., "That without expressing any opinion as to the advisability, or otherwise, of public prosecutors being appointed in densely peopled districts, this court desires to place on record its opinion that the appointment of such an officer is not desirable in the county of Norfolk."

I am, &c.

CHARLES FOSTER,
Clerk of the Peace for the County of Norfolk.

From MR. LANGRIDGE.

SIR, County Hall, Lewes, 14th January 1873.

WITH reference to your letter of the 15th August last, on the subject of a Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, I have the honour to forward you copy of a letter thereon received from Captain Noble, one of the magistrates of this county.

I have, &c.

W. K. J. LANGRIDGE,
Clerk of the Peace for the County of Sussex.

From CAPTAIN NOBLE.

SIR, Forest Lodge, Maresfield, Uckfield,
20th December 1872.

WITH reference to the request with which I have been honoured by Mr. Secretary Bruce, that I should transmit to him (through you) my opinion of the Public Prosecutors Bill, I have only to observe that the exceeding vagueness of clause 3 renders it very difficult to form any definite judgment on it, inasmuch as it appears to me in effect to subject everything to the will and pleasure of a Secretary of State for the time being, and so to render it absolutely uncertain as to when and how the public prosecutor will be called upon to exercise his functions. I ought, perhaps, to add, that the succeeding clauses are very much more definite, but that (as I read the Bill) they are entirely overridden by that to which I have referred.

One more suggestion, and one only, occurs to me. It is this, assuming the principle of the proposed legislation to be sound, why should it not be extended to cases heard under the Criminal Justice Act (18 & 19 Vict. c. 126)? These only differ in degree, and not in the least in kind, from indictable ones, and, as far as my experience

as a magistrate extends, fail at least as often as any other class of cases, from the want of efficient conduct of the prosecution.

I have, &c.

WILLIAM NOBLE,
Justice of the Peace for the County of Sussex.

From MR. BEAL.

Clerk of the Peace Office, St. Albans, Herts,
SIR, 18th January 1873.

REFERRING to your circular letter dated the 16th of September, transmitting a copy of a Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, I am directed by the court of quarter sessions for this county to send to you a copy of the report upon the subject of the Bill, presented by the parliamentary committee, and adopted by the court.

I am also to inform you that, in accordance with your request, copies of the Bill have been forwarded to justices known to take an active part in quarter sessions business.

I am, &c.

EDWARD WILLIAM BEAL,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace of the County of Hertford.

COUNTY OF HERTFORD.

Epiphany Quarter Sessions, 1873.

To the Justices of the Peace for the County of Hertford in Quarter Sessions assembled.

REPORT of the PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

Shire Hall, Hertford; 31st December 1872.

YOUR committee beg to report that they have had under consideration a Bill "for the appointment of a public prosecutor, and the better administration of justice," as amended in committee during the last Session of Parliament. A copy of the Bill has been sent to each justices' clerk of the county, with the request that, after perusal by him, it might be handed to the chairman of the division. The chairmen and clerks were invited to send to the committee any suggestions they might desire to make with reference to the Bill.

Your committee have not been favoured with any communications in reply to this invitation.

The Bill deals with two distinct subjects,—the appointment of a public prosecutor, and the compulsory payment by salary of all clerks of the peace and justices' clerks. The latter subject has less interest for this county, inasmuch as the system of payment by salary has already been adopted.

Your committee are of opinion that the appointment of a public prosecutor is very desirable, and they consider that the qualification prescribed by the Bill, namely, that a public prosecutor should be an "attorney-at-law, who either is a clerk to special and petty sessions, or a clerk to justices, paid by salary, or who, not being such a clerk, has practised for not less than three years previous to his appointment," is a reasonable and proper qualification.

Your committee are further of opinion that the Bill is capable of improvement in the following particulars:—

(1.) Various duties, of a more or less onerous nature, and involving the expenditure of considerable time and trouble, are assigned by the Bill to the clerks of assize, clerks of the peace, and justices' clerks, but no provision is made for remuneration. Your committee have no objection to offer to such duties being cast upon these officials, but they consider that, in order to secure their faithful performance, reasonable remuneration should be allowed.

(2.) The last paragraph of section 4 provides that "any question which may arise with respect to the transmission, delivering, or certifying of depositions, recognizances, documents, or things, in pursuance of this section, shall be decided by a Secretary of State, whose decision shall be final."

Your committee are of opinion that in this paragraph the court before whom the case is brought should be substituted for the Secretary of State.

(3.) Section 5 contains a useful provision for the substitution of a private prosecutor, in case of which, from special circumstances, it may be desirable that the public

prosecutor should not act. The clause would be improved, in the opinion of your committee, by giving to a judge in chambers (should that not already be the effect of the Bill) the power to make an order of substitution. The cost of obtaining such an order would be reduced by this change.

(4.) Section 6 provides that every public prosecutor shall hold office during the pleasure of the Secretary of State. Your committee are of opinion that this is an objectionable provision, which might have the effect of deterring competent men from accepting an office held on so frail a tenure. A public officer of this kind should hold office during competency and good behaviour, and be removable only in some way similar to that in which a clerk of the peace is now removable.

(5.) The power vested in the Secretary of State by section 7, enabling him to reject all the persons recommended for the office by the local authority, appears to your committee to need revision. It may be presumed that the local authority will recommend at least one man suitable for the post, and of his suitability the justices may be taken to be as well able to judge as the Secretary of State.

(6.) Section 12 obliges the public prosecutor to make disbursements for expenses, which may, in some cases, amount to a large sum. It does not appear that the public prosecutor is to be provided with funds for this purpose.

The latter part of the same section enables the court to review the taxation of the public prosecutor, but does not allow the court, under any circumstances, to grant allowances beyond the sums prescribed by the regulations. In some cases this might work great hardships.

(7.) The provisions of sub-section 3, section 14, enabling the Secretary of State to make a new table of fees whenever he pleases, without any communication with the justices, are very objectionable.

(8.) It would perhaps be an advantage to get rid of the first schedule, and to make the public prosecutor take cognizance of all indictable offences, leaving the Secretary of State power to restrict, instead of power to enlarge, the sphere of his duties.

The court will no doubt remember that the Home Secretary forwarded a copy of the Bill to the chairman of quarter sessions, and invited suggestions from the court. Your committee recommend that a copy of so much of this report as may meet the approval of the court be forwarded to the Home Secretary in answer to that communication.

They further recommend that the county members be requested, upon the introduction of the Bill next Session, to endeavour to obtain the amendments sanctioned by the court.

Signed, on behalf of the committee,
SALISBURY BAXENDALE,
Chairman.

From MR. HILDYARD.

Hutton Bonville, Northallerton,

SIR, 21st January 1873.

I HAVE the honour to communicate to you the opinion of the magistrates of the North Riding of Yorkshire on the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, as expressed by them at the quarter sessions held at Northallerton on December 31st last.

And I have been instructed to state that, while the court approved of the principle involved in the appointment of public prosecutors, it considered that the machinery provided by the Bill is, for such an object, imperfect; and that the powers of the public prosecutors are therein not sufficiently defined.

Being invited by your letter to offer any suggestions upon the Bill, I venture to add the following observations, which appear to arise on the sections referred to.

Section 5.—From the latter part of sub-section (2) of this section it would appear that the existing machinery for the conduct of criminal prosecutions is to be preserved.

Section 6.—The appointment of an attorney-at-law of three years' standing, to be either a public prosecutor, or the deputy of a public prosecutor, appears to be much too inexperienced an officer to conduct the entire criminal business of the country.

Except in cases of absolute necessity, the duties should never be left to a deputy.

Section 7.—There should never be a time, however short, during which no effective public prosecutor for a district may be in existence; it is possible that for six months no appointment may be effectually made; and though the Secretary of State may

appoint a temporary public prosecutor, the duty is not obligatory, and he may not be apprised of a vacancy.

Section 8.—Except in cases of necessity, the public prosecutor should himself discharge the duties of his office; and if a deputy is to be appointed, the appointment should be made in the same manner as that of his principal, and should not be left to the choice of the public prosecutor.

In the office of clerk of the peace, of coroners, and of registrar of deaths, where a deputy is allowed by law, it has been observed that the duties are chiefly performed by the deputy.

Section 3.—The language of sub-section (3) of this section appears a little involved.

To enact that a Secretary of State may make *regulations for prescribing* what is already authorised by the Bill to be prescribed by his regulations under the Act may give rise to some uncertainty of construction. The criminal proceedings which are, or which are not, to be instituted by a public prosecutor, and his duties also, in relation to their conduct, should, I think, be defined by the Bill; the details of the machinery should be left to the regulations of the Secretary of State.

But the Bill practically transfers to a Secretary of State the cognizance of every criminal prosecution in the country. If the Secretary of State for the Home Department is intended, I venture to think that duties are assigned to his office which will prove an overwhelming increase to his present labours. The mainspring of the administration of justice should, in my opinion, rest with a minister of justice.

I have, &c.

JOHN R. W. HILDYARD,

Chairman of Quarter Sessions, North Riding of Yorkshire.

From MR. FOWLER.

Preston Hall, Stockton-on-Tees,

21st January 1873.

SIR,

IN consequence of a long absence I have never been able to send you, as requested, the opinion of my brother magistrates and myself, as well as our clerk, respecting the proposed Bill for a paid prosecutor. As Mr. Faber's letter embraces rather more than the magistrates decided to send themselves, I have only sent you his letter addressed to myself, in which we at the same time fully concur.

I have, &c.

MARSHALL FOWLER.

Town Clerk's Office, Stockton-on-Tees,

11th October 1872.

DEAR SIR,

As requested by you, I have perused "The Public Prosecutors Bill, 1872," and now submit to you my observations thereon for your consideration.

1. The Bill evidently contemplates by section 6 that clerks to the magistrates will be appointed public prosecutors both in counties and boroughs. In the case of the latter, the clerk to the borough justices is expressly forbidden, under a penalty of 100*l.*, to be concerned in the prosecution of any person committed for trial by borough justices; *vide* 5 & 6 Will. 4. c. 76. s. 102. This section is not repealed in Schedule 3 of the proposed Act. On the ground of economy the clerk to the justices would be a desirable person to appoint, for, as it is his duty to be present with the committing magistrates, he could not expect any fee for attendance, which another public prosecutor certainly would; but, on the other hand, I do not see how he could initiate or conduct proceedings in the court to which he was the clerk or adviser without at any rate some very special regulations were inserted in the Act respecting it, otherwise, no matter how conscientiously he might do his duty, he would always be open to the accusation that he had advised a committal for the sake of the fees and on this ground; I think a public prosecutor should in all cases be paid by salary and not by fees. Under any regulations, however, that could be devised, the position of a public prosecutor, who was also clerk to the justices, conducting a case before his own Bench would be so anomalous that I think clerks to justices ought not to be appointed public prosecutors.

2. Some idea of what the salary will be should be given at once. If it is fixed on anything like the present scale of fees allowed to an attorney going to sessions, no respectable attorney will take the office. When the present scale of costs was fixed I made a calculation, and found that if I took a prosecution at the Durham sessions, by leaving Stockton by the 7.40 a.m. train, and returning at 9.30 p.m.,

and allowing myself 1s. 6d. for refreshment during that time, I should reach home with 10s. 6d. as the result of such a day's work. There is also another reason why some idea should be given of the salary. By section 9 of the Bill a public prosecutor cannot act as an election or registration agent, or in any manner interfere in an election. In Stockton there are certainly not more than two attorneys who would not either be disqualified or would have to resign an appointment under this section. Some idea of the salary should, therefore, be given, in order that a man may know whether he would gain or lose by accepting the appointment.

3. I am greatly in favour of paying justices' clerks by salary instead of fees, but section 13 should contain some provision for the revision of the salaries from time to time. It ought to be competent for the justices or other governing body on the one hand, and for the clerk on the other, to demand a revision of the salary to be taken on the average of the three last preceding years. In towns like Stockton, Middlesbrough, and Darlington, the work of the clerk to the justices increases weekly. Between the Census of 1861 and that of 1871 Middlesbrough increased in population 107 per cent., and Stockton nearly 115.

4. There are two other matters connected with the Bill generally which occur to me. The first is, that if public prosecutors are properly paid, I am of opinion that the cost of the administration of the criminal law will be enormously increased, and unnecessarily increased; if a proper and therefore better scale of costs than the present were allowed to prosecuting attorneys before the magistrates, and at assizes and quarter sessions, I am convinced that the work would be better done and more cheaply than by public prosecutors. If you have, as you must have, a public prosecutor for each petty sessional division the expense will be very great; if you have only two or three for the county they cannot do the work. If, however, it is deemed advisable to have public prosecutors, other changes should be made in what I may term magistrates' law; and amongst them, increased jurisdiction to justices, and a revised mode of procedure for work done out of petty sessions,—in fact, a new Jervis' Act. I will make a few suggestions on this head hereafter.

The second point to which I would call attention more nearly concerns the Bar, but I mention it. If a public prosecutor does his duty, he will of course give all his briefs to the best counsel, and thus the whole business at sessions will be concentrated in the hands of two or three counsel, and young men joining the Bar will have no chance of proving themselves. If, however, public prosecutors are to be compelled or expected to give their briefs to counsel in rotation, this anomaly will arise—they will have of course considerable responsibility, and yet be obliged to work with tools which they would not employ for themselves, or for any private client.

I now proceed to point out some points in which the course of procedure in magistrates' cases out of petty sessions might be altered and improved even by this Bill. I do not mean for one moment to hint that these are the only or the most important points, but still they are so desirable and so simple that they might be inserted in an Act which deals with justices' clerks' salaries. An extension of the jurisdiction of justices is too great a matter for discussion here.

1. Every court of petty sessions should have a seal (I give an impression of the borough one for licensing purposes). Under this seal all summons should be issued by the clerk without troubling any magistrate.

2. All warrants, as at present, should be under the hand and seal of a magistrate.

3. No information on which a summons is issued shall be on oath.

4. Every information on which a warrant is issued shall be on oath.

5. The next is an important subject. I would propose that a prior conviction should be proved by the production of the record book of proceedings kept by the clerk to the justices, or by a certified extract from that book, under the seal of the court. I need not remind you that there are several Statutes which impose higher penalties on second and third convictions (c. 9., the Vagrant Act), but these higher penalties are very seldom inflicted. To be enabled to inflict a higher penalty legally the prior conviction must be proved. That conviction has been returned to the clerk of the peace, and it can only be proved by its production, or a certificate under the seal of the court. The clerk of the peace's fee for the certificate is 5s., but as there is no fund in a petty sessional court out of which to pay it the certificate is never applied for. I cannot see any objection to the plan I propose, which has, moreover, been already adopted in the Licensing Act, 1872.

6. Unless the payment of magistrates' clerks by salary instead of fees is made compulsory, some provision should be made by the Act for payment of the fees in cases where the defendants are committed to prison either directly or in default of payment of a fine. In the county of Durham it has been the practice to grant summons to policemen without any payment, and if the summons is dismissed, or the defendant goes to prison, the clerk receives no remuneration; and in this county this class of cases is rapidly increasing. I would suggest that the clerks' fees in such cases, and in cases where the justices excuse any person from payment of fees, should in counties be paid by the county treasurer, and in boroughs by the corporation.

7. This would entail some expense, as would also the payment of clerks by salary, which should, I think, be met by awarding the fines inflicted to the parties liable to pay these costs; I don't say all the fines, but all except those which either go to an informer or the party aggrieved. These few alterations might, I think, be introduced into the Bill, but I should also like to see a new and comprehensive Act for magistrates' work.

I remain, &c.

H. Y. FABER,
Clerk.

FROM MESSRS. BIRCHALL, WILSON, AND HULTON.

Clerk of the Peace's Office for Lancashire, Preston,
24th January 1873.

SIR, WITH reference to your circular of the 16th September last, transmitting copies of a Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, and requesting to be favoured with the opinion of the magistrates of this county thereon, we have now the honour to enclose you copies of reports and resolutions adopted at the last quarter sessions for this county held at Lancaster, Manchester, and Kirkdale respectively.

We have, &c.

BIRCHALL, WILSON, AND HULTON.

KIRKDALE QUARTER SESSIONS, 14th January 1873.

LANCASHIRE (TO WIT).—At the general quarter sessions of the peace of our Lady the Queen, holden by adjournment at Kirkdale, in and for the county palatine of Lancaster, on Tuesday the fourteenth day of January, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, before the Right Honourable the Earl of Derby, chairman, Richard Assheton Cross, M.P., Robert Neilson, and Edward Gibbon, Esquires, and others, their fellows, then and there present, justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen, in the said county, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors in the said county perpetrated.

The report of the special committee on the Public Prosecutors Bill was received and read.

Resolved—That the report now read be adopted, and that the clerk of the peace be directed to transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of State for the Home Department as a reply to his circular of the 16th September last.

By the Court,
BIRCHALL, WILSON, AND HULTON,
Deputy Clerks of the Peace.

The committee appointed to inquire into the Public Prosecutors Bill have held three meetings, at which the subject referred to them was discussed.

The first question which they have to consider is whether any practical necessity has been shown for a legislative change of the nature proposed.

The committee are not insensible to the weight of the authority which has been brought forward in favour of the appointment of public prosecutors, nor are they prepared to condemn the principle involved in such an appointment; but they feel bound to add that there appears to be in the localities which they represent no strong feeling against the present system, nor are they aware that any practical abuses have arisen therefrom.

The question whether such officers should be appointed or not appears to be one of general policy, on which your committee are unwilling to offer an opinion without more opportunity than they possess of ascertaining the state of things which exist in other counties, and the general feeling both of the legal profession and the public.

They observe that the last parliamentary inquiry on the subject dates from the year 1856, and they think it a question deserving the consideration of the Home Office, whether steps should not be taken, previous to any general legislation, to ascertain how far the state of things then represented to exist, and the then expressed opinion of the heads of the legal profession, may have been modified by the lapse of 16 years.

They observe that the adoption of the Act by any county or borough is made optional with the local authority of such county or borough, but that, as an inducement to adopt it, the costs of prosecutions where it is put in force will be paid by the Treasury direct, thus avoiding the disputes which have frequently arisen when such costs have been disallowed. In this county the amount of disallowance, and consequent increase of local expenditure, has of late been small, and the pecuniary relief granted would not be considerable.

Your committee are of opinion that if the system of public prosecutors is to be introduced, it should, in the first instance at least, be made optional and not compulsory, with a view to its working being practically tested before its general introduction; and in this respect they concur with the principle laid down in the Bill.

The duties imposed by the Bill on the public prosecutor appear to your committee to be insufficiently defined. The discretion left to the Secretary of State as to making, revoking, and altering regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of the Act is so wide as to leave it practically uncertain what the real duties of this officer are to be. This uncertainty, they think, ought not to continue.

(Signed) **DERBY;**
Chairman.

SALFORD HUNDRED QUARTER SESSIONS, 6th January 1873.

LANCASHIRE (TO WIT).—At the general quarter sessions of the peace of our Lady the Queen, holden by adjournment at Manchester, in and for the county palatine of Lancaster, on Monday the sixth day of January, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, before William Housman Higgin, Esquire, Q.C., chairman, Sir Elkanah Armitage, Knight, Edmund Ashworth, and John Tomlinson Hibbert, M.P., Esquires, and others, their fellows, then and there present, justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen, in the said county, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors in the said county perpetrated.

The report of the special committee on the Public Prosecutors Bill was received and read.

Resolved—That the report now read be adopted, and that the clerk of the peace be directed to transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of State for the Home Department as a reply to his circular of the 16th September last.

By the Court,
BIRCHALL, WILSON, AND HULTON,
Deputy Clerks of the Peace.

MANCHESTER QUARTER SESSIONS, 6th January 1873.

REPORT of the Committee appointed by the Court of Adjourned Quarter Sessions held at Manchester on the 19th August 1872.

YOUR committee have given their careful attention to the proposed Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors.

They considered, first, the general expediency of the measure, and its applicability to the populous and important district over which the jurisdiction of this court extends.

Your committee are aware that objections have been urged against the existing system by authorities whose experience and judgment are entitled to consideration. But no member of this committee is able to recall the occurrence within his own magisterial experience of any practical abuse or any failure of justice by reason of any defect in the present machinery for instituting or conducting prosecutions. The discovery and the preliminary investigation of offences, and the securing and apprehending the suspected offenders, as now conducted by the police authorities, conduce efficiently and with reasonable expedition and economy to the punishment or repression of crime; whilst the judicial examinations, committals, or dismissals of the accused parties by the magistrates, assisted as they are by the advice of their clerks, as well preclude the possibility of groundless or vexatious accusations as prevent the escape of real criminals.

It is true that in many cases in this part of the county prosecutions at assizes and quarter sessions are conducted by the magistrates' clerks. But your committee have no reason to suspect that those officers have permitted considerations of personal profit to operate in advising either committals or dismissals; much less that magistrates have allowed themselves to be made the instruments of such designs. On the contrary, not only are the clerks to magistrates, as a rule, gentlemen of high standing in their profession, and honourable and disinterested in its practice; but were this not the case, the emoluments derivable from the conduct of prosecutions are now so very trifling that they are not matter of sufficient consideration to offer inducement to corrupt practices.

As regards the magistracy, the Bill would have a tendency to interfere with and trammel the exercise of their judicial functions; subjecting them to the dictation of State officials, possibly in antagonism to the advice of their own tried and trusted clerks who are responsible to them for the advice they give.

With reference to the clerks to the magistrates, your committee would remind the court that now each magistrate possesses the power to appoint his own clerk. Throughout the hundred of Salford, with the exception of the district under the jurisdiction of the stipendiary magistrate appointed under the local Act, such is universally the case, and frequently in the same petty sessional division there are several clerks acting for individual magistrates. If from this number one public prosecutor is to be appointed the rest of the clerks would practically be deprived of that portion of their emoluments which arises from the conduct of the criminal business of the division, and which would be transferred to the one clerk, who might, under the Bill, be selected by the Secretary of State for the office of prosecutor.

Again, as regards the effect of the proposed measure upon the gentlemen of the Bar, your committee feel that grave considerations of expediency present themselves when it is reflected that the entire distribution of the briefs in criminal cases would rest in the hands of one man, subject to his caprice, favouritism, or prejudice.

Your committee have not observed that any strong or general public feeling exists condemnatory of the existing system, or favourable to the contemplated innovation.

On the whole, they think that it would be an uncertain and dangerous experiment to subvert the existing and long-established practice, and to substitute for it a scheme so crude as that sketched out in the Bill under consideration.

Holding these grave objections to the principle of the measure, your committee have also given some attention to its details, and some apparent objections have been noticed by them, which they think it right to bring to the attention of the court.

The powers proposed to be given to the Secretary of State appear too extensive and arbitrary. He is not only to appoint the public prosecutor, having power to reject every candidate recommended to him by the magistrates, but he is to decide upon the numbers of such officers to be appointed for each county or borough, to fix the districts in which they are to act, and to determine (with the concurrence of the Treasury) the amounts of their salaries; and by section 6 every public prosecutor shall hold office only during the pleasure of the Secretary of State. The Bill, too, does not attempt to define the limits to which the functions of the public prosecutors are to extend. It is left quite uncertain whether they are to initiate inquiries and investigations, with a view to the detection of offenders preparatory to their being apprehended, to look up the evidence, and to conduct the examinations before the justices below, or whether they are simply to be called into action by the magistrates' clerks after committals have taken place. The ordering of these duties is given to the Secretary of State, who, by section 3, is empowered to "define and regulate the duties" of public

prosecutors, and to "determine what criminal proceedings they are or are not to institute, conduct, or appear in." The powers of Parliament are thus delegated to the Secretary of State. An officer under the direct control and influence of a State official would thus become the prosecutor in all cases to which the Act applies. These include all ordinary cases of felony and indictable misdemeanor, charges of forgery, embezzlement, and false pretences, as is well known frequently occur in which private individuals and trading companies are peculiarly interested; but by the Bill the aggrieved parties are excluded from the right to prosecute, unless authorized to do so by a superior court or a judge; such authorization being only obtainable by a process which would be tedious and expensive, and so conducive to failure of justice.

The adoption of the measure is by the Bill left optional with the "local authority," which, in Lancashire, would be the court of annual general session at Preston. But as an inducement to its adoption, or by way of penalty for its non-adoption, the costs of prosecutions are to be paid by the Treasury direct in those jurisdictions only where the Act is put in force; in those cases costs are no longer to be taxed by the officers of the courts, and paid by their order upon the county treasurer as at present, but the taxation is to be by the public prosecutors themselves, the clerks of assize and clerks of the peace being merely required to "give aid" to them in such taxation. The control of the expenditure of the county in respect of the costs of prosecutions would thus be entirely taken away from the magistrates, and the courts in which the trials are held, under the guise of their being transferred to the national fund. Considering the large proportion of the imperial taxation which is borne by the county of Lancaster, the advantage to be thus afforded to its taxpayers would be of very doubtful value.

Assuming, therefore, even that the measure is one called for by considerations of public polity, your committee are of opinion that its object would not be satisfactorily and efficiently accomplished by the Bill as it at present stands.

(Signed) W. H. HIGGIN,
Chairman.

LANCASTER QUARTER SESSIONS, 30th December 1872.

LANCASHIRE (TO WIT).—At the general quarter sessions of the peace of our Lady the Queen, holden at Lancaster, in and for the county palatine of Lancaster, on Monday the thirtieth day of December, in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, before Richard Assheton Cross, Esquire, M.P., chairman, Sir James Ramsden, Knight, William James Garnett, and Edward Denis de Vitre, M.D., Esquires, and others, their fellows, then and there present, justices of our said Lady the Queen, assigned to keep the peace of our said Lady the Queen, in the said county, and also to hear and determine divers felonies, trespasses, and other misdemeanors in the said county perpetrated.

The report of the committee appointed to consider the Public Prosecutors Bill was received and read.

Resolved.—That the same be adopted, and that the clerk of the peace be directed to transmit a copy thereof to the Secretary of State for the Home Department as the reply of this court to his circular of the 16th September last.

By the Court,
BIRCHALL, WILSON, AND HULTON,
Deputy Clerks of the Peace.

REPORT of the Committee appointed to consider the Public Prosecutors Bill.

YOUR committee beg to report that they have considered the provisions of the Public Prosecutors Bill, and that they have come to the following resolutions with reference thereto:—

Duties as laid down in clause 3 too vague.

Too much power to Secretary of State, paragraph 3, lines 18 and 25, and page 2, lines 1 to 3, and 4 to 6. Such matters should be more clearly defined in the Act itself.

Clause 7.—Areas of districts should be fixed by courts of quarter sessions.

Clause 6.—Persons eligible for appointment to include barristers.

Clause 11.—Subject of costs of prosecutions not connected with the appointment of public prosecutors.

Clause 20.—Adoption of Act should be made compulsory.

Form of Schedule 3 shows how necessary it is that a consolidation of statute law should be effectuated.

(Signed) RICH. ASSHETON CROSS,
Chairman.

From Mr.

Clerk of the Peace's Office, Shirehall, Hereford,

SIR, 24th January 1873.

REFERRING to Mr. Winterbotham's circular of the 30th of September last, I forward to you, as requested by Capt. Power, some observations of his on the proposed Bill and other matters connected with it, and which I should have done before, but have waited to see if any other magistrate to whom a print of the Bill was sent would contribute any observation on it, but none other has been received by me up to this time.

I have, &c.

Clerk of the Peace.

From CAPT. POWER.

MEMORANDA.

IN sentencing prisoners before justices the present practice is to divide the award as "penalty" and "costs," the amount of the former depending upon the amount of the "costs," such costs varying in almost identical cases upon the distance the summons has to be served, and the number of witnesses required to prove the case. In reporting the punishment awarded the penalty is often quoted without reference to costs, &c., and when the "costs" are high the consequent low "penalty" misleads the lower classes whom it most affects, and the punishment thus appears at first sight inadequate, and loses its deterrent effect.

Often in minor cases where the costs are high justices are only able to award the apparently insignificant and nominal *penalty* of "sixpence." I have known cases of animals found straying on the highway where the costs have amounted to 16s.; in such cases even the "costs" alone are an excessive punishment. I would suggest that in future the word "costs" should be discontinued, and the award of punishment consist of a lump sum as "penalty," which being paid to the county fund would come to the same thing and be more easily understood by the criminal class.

In cases of orders, and civil matters decided by justices, a scale of fees might still be continued as "expenses."

In cases of assault and like offences complainants are often put to a great hardship with reference to the payment of their witnesses, and their expenses, when the defendant is committed in default of payment. An order upon the union is unjust, and auditors frequently object to items in the overseers' accounts for such purposes. Some provision should be made for the payment of such expenses from a public fund when certified.

As a proof that the legislation does not contemplate excessive "costs," it is enacted in the Wild Birds Bill of the last Session that for the *second offence* the penalty shall not exceed 5s., *including the costs* of conviction.

The attendance of the public prosecutor before grand juries, particularly at *quarter sessions*, is desirable, to bring the witnesses before the jury in proper order, and assist in examining them. The jury not having the depositions before them are often at a loss as to the particulars of the several cases.

Although the above remarks do not perhaps refer directly to the proposed provisions of the "Public Prosecutors Bill," to which I can make no objections, they occur to me as desirable in the administration of justice by justices, and that they would enable them to adopt a mean uniform scale of punishments.

Power,
The Hill Court, Ross, J.P. for the County of Hereford.
31st December 1872.

From MR. OWEN.

Clerk of the Peace Office, Beaumaris,
27th January 1873.

SIR, I AM directed by the justices assembled at the Hilary sessions to state that the proposed Public Prosecutors Bill was taken into consideration by them, and its adoption was submitted to a vote, when all objected to it.

I am, &c.

RICHARD OWEN,
Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. DICKSON.

SIR, Alnwick, 30th January 1873.

IN consequence of your letter of the 16th September 1872, I sent a copy of your communication to the justices respecting the appointment of a public prosecutor.

I have only got two replies, of which I enclose copies.

The justices generally in quarter sessions disapprove of the measure; they discussed it, but made no order.

I remain, &c.

WM. DICKSON,
Clerk of the Peace for Northumberland.

From MR. ASKEW.

SIR, Pallinsburn, Cornhill, Northumberland,
2nd October 1872.

IN reply to your communication enclosing me a copy of the Public Prosecutors Bill, and requesting my opinion upon it, I have to express my entire approval of the proposed measure with the exception of clause No. 6. I cannot think justices' clerks, who are the legal advisers of the magistrates, should be eligible for the office, and should like myself to see the office confined to members of the Bar.

I remain, &c.

WATSON ASKEW.

From MR. SANDERSON.

I AM of opinion that the appointment of a public prosecutor as proposed by the Bill in question will be of no advantage to this county, but, on the contrary, will in the following respects lead to serious inconvenience if not abuse, and will entail also unnecessary expense. If the prosecution of all indictable offences is left in the hands of one or more persons it must necessarily lead to the two following results with reference to the Bar.

Either that of employing certain members of it continuously, who may be special friends of the public prosecutor, or to his giving cases to the members of the Bar in turn—the incompetent as well as the competent. In the first place the public prosecutor will exercise a patronage which is very improper, unfair, and mischievous; in the second he will very frequently have to commit cases to most incompetent advocates. At present attorneys generally endeavour to employ in prosecutions the best counsel they can obtain at the very inadequate remuneration allowed them, or if they do frequently employ friends of their own, the mischief from the diffusion of business among different attorneys arising from this, referred to as likely to arise in the case of public prosecutors, is prevented, and abler members of the Bar have a fair and competitive field left over to them,—a state of things which is of equal advantage to themselves and to the public interest.

As to the greater probability of crime being detected by the appointment of public prosecutors than at present, it may safely be said that, since the establishment of the county police, offences, at least of the serious nature of those punishable by indictment, can escape notice to a very limited extent, and as to the greater care with which cases would be investigated and prepared for trial by the proposed officer, the same can at less cost than that proposed in the Bill would be obtained by increasing the notoriously inadequate compensation now paid to prosecuting attorneys, to counsel, and to witnesses, so inadequate in many instances that it is quite impossible for attorneys in different cases to get them up as they ought to be without incurring a personal loss of money

instead of payment for services rendered. The allowance for witnesses also in districts of the county where wages are high are so inadequate that witnesses will do their best to avoid being dragged into a position at once of annoyance and personal loss.

With reference to the proposal to make the payment of justices' clerks by salary, this arrangement has been in operation in the county of Northumberland with great advantage and with scarcely any loss to the county, and it has been found in all respects a desirable arrangement.

I am, &c.

R. BURDON SANDERSON,
Chairman of the Police Committee.

From MR. KENYON.

Pradoc, near Shrewsbury,

SIR, 4th February 1873.

WITH reference to your letters of the 15th of August and the 30th of September last, written to me by direction of Mr. Secretary Bruce, relative to the proposed Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, I beg to state, for his information, that I brought the subject before the magistrates of this county, as requested, at the October sessions, when I stated the nature of the proposed Bill with a view to its being more fully considered at the following Epiphany sessions. I also caused copies of the Bill to be sent to each petty sessional division for the consideration of the magistrates there. Prior to the late Epiphany sessions I brought the subject before the police and finance committees, and ascertained the views of the magistrates of the petty sessional divisions, and ultimately I brought it before the court on the 30th of December last, when it was fully considered.

The court, agreeing with the opinions previously obtained from the magistrates in the manner I have mentioned, resolved, unanimously, that in their opinion the appointment of public prosecutors is not desirable in this county. They wished, however, to suggest that, if from any exceptional circumstances it should appear in any case necessary for the ends of justice, the chief constable or other proper person should be directed to prosecute, and to employ an attorney, appointed by the police committee of magistrates, to conduct the proceedings on behalf of the county.

I may add that in my own experience of seventeen years as vice-chairman and chairman of the sessions, and during a longer experience as Recorder of Oswestry, I have seen no want of such an officer as a public prosecutor.

I have, &c.

J. R. KENYON,
Chairman of the Court of Quarter Sessions
for Shropshire.

From MR. BARTON.

The Guildhall, Exeter;

SIR,

6th February 1873.

I HAVE the honour to state, that in accordance with your circular, the borough justices of Exeter have considered the provisions of the Public Prosecutors Bill, No. 203, and beg to forward the enclosed as their opinion and suggestions thereon, for your better consideration.

I have, &c.

HENRY D. BARTON,
Clerk to the Justices.

The borough justices of Exeter approve of the principle of the appointment of a public prosecutor, provided that there be exercised over him some proper control for restraining vexatious and trivial prosecutions, and providing remedies in cases of the kind, which does not appear to be contained in the Bill.

The justices also consider that his power to institute, conduct, or appear in any proceedings before the justices, or otherwise, should be directly affirmed in the Bill, which appears doubtful under the third section.

The justices are also of opinion that the Bill should not in any way interfere with private prosecution, nor prevent a private individual from selecting any attorney to prosecute, as he or she may think fit, and without the necessity of applying to the Secretary of State.

The justices are further of opinion, that the Bill should put it out of the power of the clerk to the justices to act as public prosecutor.

HENRY D. BARTON,

Exeter, 6th February 1873. Clerk to the Justices.

From MR. LASLETT.

Abberton Hall, Pershore,

DEAR SIR, 16th October 1873.

I HAVE been favoured by you, through the clerk of the peace of the city of Worcester, with a print of a Public Prosecutors Bill for my opinion and suggestions thereon.

As I object to the purpose of the Bill, I have no suggestions to offer, unless I may be allowed to submit that, inasmuch as we possess a very active and efficient police force, quite equal to all purposes, the very large expenditure that would attend the carrying out of the Public Prosecutors Bill should be avoided, more especially considering the great addition to imperial and local taxation needed to carry out the Acts passed last Session for the improvement (as I hope) of local improvements.

I have, &c.

W. LASLETT.

From MR. HILL.

Catherine Hill House, Worcester,

MY DEAR SIR, 3rd January 1873.

REFERRING to your note of 28th September, as to the Public Prosecutors Bill, I beg leave to say that I entirely approve of the principle of the Bill, that there should be a public prosecutor appointed to act in each district of the country. There is one clause (20) which makes the operation of the Act contingent on the approval of the local authority, which I think very objectionable. In the Highway Act a similar provision has worked very disadvantageously, and it really seems to invest local authorities with *legislative*, instead of merely *administrative* powers, because really they would decide what should be the law in their district. It appears to me that Parliament is the proper body to fix the law, and the local authority should be executive only.

I have, &c.

T. ROWLEY HILL.

From MR. SMITH.

OBSERVATIONS by a GLOUCESTERSHIRE MAGISTRATE.

ALTHOUGH the Bill assumes that there may be only one public prosecutor for a whole county, yet it is clear that there must (in the case of such a county as Gloucestershire) be several. It would be physically impossible that the same person could perform the duties in two or more different petty sessional divisions at the same time; so that there must be in such cases a delay if not a failure of justice, at great inconvenience to all parties; and in any such case a large sum would be necessarily expended in travelling charges. The preparation of a proper brief for counsel does not consist in the mere copying of the depositions, &c., but the attorney ought himself to see all the witnesses so as to be able to instruct counsel as to their several antecedents, dispositions, and credibility, and to give such information as will afford topics for the cross-examination of any witnesses and answers to any points that are likely to be called or raised for the defence, and for that purpose several journeys may be necessary for, say, a public prosecutor living at Cirencester to prosecute a case arising in the Lawford's Gate district. If, therefore, there be only one public prosecutor for Gloucestershire he must have an army of clerks or other subordinates, and in substance it would result in there being a *sinecure* public prosecutor with a

number of deputies; over whom no one would have any substantial control, and who would take between them a portion of the salary allowed to the principal, the remainder being received by him for doing nothing.

Suppose on the other hand that separate independent attorneys are appointed public prosecutors for, say, each petty sessional division—*cui bono?* Is it not likely that they may be engaged in their own proper professional business at a time when their services are required in their official capacity? And in any case would not the justices' clerk be more likely to act with effect in the prosecution? And what advantages would be derived from the payment of the public prosecutor's salary in addition to that of the justices' clerk? It is not easy to see how such an arrangement would promote the benefit of the public. If the justices' clerks be (as is almost certain) men of experience, integrity, and ability, they must surely be better qualified and inclined to conduct prosecutions than any independent attorney of three years' standing, and there is no observation as to motives, &c. which would not be at least as applicable to the attorney as they would be to the justices' clerk.

Then, with respect to the remuneration of public prosecutors! They are to have a fixed salary (though how the amount is to be estimated does not appear), and also all costs properly incurred by them in the execution of their office! Is the salary to include professional charges for (*e.g.*) the prepayment of briefs for counsel? If yea, can it be reasonably expected that such briefs will contain any of the information above alluded to, or, indeed, anything beyond a copy of the depositions, &c. taken by the justices' clerk, and which might (and probably would) be prepared by a law stationer? But if the ordinary professional charges for briefs, &c. are to be extras, then it is in the power of a public prosecutor to run up a heavy bill in every case which may be under his control, and thus all the disadvantages of the existing system would be retained without a single redeeming feature, and with the addition of the fixed salaries to the several public prosecutors, which, when calculated upon the number necessary to supply the wants of every distinct petty sessional division in the kingdom, would be enormous!

It is therefore considered that the appointment of public prosecutors from amongst the attorneys would be inconvenient and disadvantageous, and that the appointment of justices' clerks to be public prosecutors as contemplated in the Bill is open to similar objections.

The duties of the justices' clerk, so far as relates to criminal offences, are to take the depositions of the witnesses who are produced, and see that no improper questions are put, and that nothing is inserted in the depositions that is not legal evidence; in fact to take care that all irregularities in the proceedings are avoided. But it is no part of his business to ferret out a crime or hunt up evidence. That is the duty of the police, and it is obvious that it must practically remain in their hands, and that the justices' clerks should continue to be their legal advisers and assistants.

According to the terms of the Bill it is not proposed that the duties or powers of a public prosecutor should ever arise, except as regards certain felonies and misdemeanors, and then only after the offender shall have been committed for trial. But it is considered that some of the most important advantages that may be expected from the appointment of public prosecutors would fail, unless they were enabled to interfere with and take up other criminal cases besides those mentioned in the Bill, and at any stage of the proceedings at which such action might be desirable.

For the reasons above stated it is considered that the proposed Bill should be entirely reconstructed; and that every necessary or desirable result which may be anticipated from the appointment of public prosecutors would be attained by a very simple and inexpensive enactment to following purport.

The superintendent, or other superior officer of police, of every petty sessional division of a county to be *ex-officio* the public prosecutor for that division; his duty being to conduct the prosecution of all criminal cases, whether felonies, misdemeanors, or others, and whether triable at the assizes, or quarter sessions, or petty sessions, which the committing or convicting authority may at any stage of the proceedings direct to be so prosecuted; the legal part of the prosecution to be in the hands of the justices' clerk; and the whole course of proceeding to be under the general control of the justices, who shall determine whether the ordinary professional fees and charges of the clerk in relation to each prosecution respectively should be included in his salary, or treated and paid for as extra services; no one to interfere with the proceedings of the public prosecutor or the clerk without the permission of the justices, except the Attorney and Solicitor General, or some one who may obtain an order to that effect from one of the superior courts.

The effect of such an enactment would be that the justices before whom any criminal case is brought, and who would be best acquainted with the circumstances would judge of the necessity or propriety of a public prosecution, and determine accordingly. This would afford every proper protection and assistance to the public against all the complaints to which private prosecutions are now inevitably exposed, and ensure the vindication of the law as against all wrong-doers, whilst it would avoid all the inconveniences of the Bill under consideration without putting the county or the country to any additional expense.

The foregoing observations apply particularly to counties proper, but they are in substance equally applicable to boroughs and metropolitan and other stipendiary districts, which might be included therein by the ordinary interpretation clause.

BROOKE SMITH.

Stoke Bishop, Bristol, 2nd December 1872.

From MR. TAYLOR.

Office of the Clerk of the Peace,

SIR, 30, The Paragon, Bath, 11th February 1873.

I HAVE just received from the clerk to the magistrates for this city and borough a resolution passed by the magistrates in reference to the Public Prosecutors Bill, and I beg to enclose you a copy of the same.

I am, &c.

JOHN TAYLOR, per F. G.,
Clerk of the Peace.

Resolved—That the Bill submitted to the justices by the Secretary of State for the Home Department appears to them to be unsatisfactory; and, further, that it does not seem to them that there is any occasion for the appointment of a public prosecutor in Bath, but that the power of justices to authorize expenditure needful for the proper conduct of prosecutions at the quarter sessions and assizes should be enlarged, and that this opinion be communicated to the clerk of the peace for Bath for the purpose of its being submitted to the Home Secretary.

From MR. SPURRELL.

Appointment of Public Prosecutors.

6. In Wales, if not in England, I think a public prosecutor is unnecessary. It would answer every purpose if the chief constable, deputy, and superintendent of the county constabulary should act and be the public prosecutors, with power to employ legal assistance when directed by justices.

I think a proviso should be inserted that nothing herein contained shall be deemed to limit the selection of persons to be appointed clerks to justices to attorneys-at-law, provided such persons shall, in the opinion of the justices or authority making the appointment, be able and sufficient persons to fill the office.

Clerks of the Peace and Justices' Clerks.

13. I think after clerks to justices have had their salaries fixed they should be empowered to receive the informations and to issue summonses, in all cases under a petty sessional division seal, to defendants and witnesses, but this not to prevent the same being done by justices as heretofore, nor to authorize justices' clerks to issue warrants of apprehension, distress, or of commitment.

Provision should be extended to clerks to justices.

14. I think uniform tables of fees should be made for the payment of witnesses, justices' clerks, constables, attorneys, and counsel, &c. up to the committal; also at sessions and assizes.

GEO. SPURRELL,

Clerk to the County Justices of Carmarthen,
St. Clears, and Kidwelly.

From MR. SMITH.

SIR, Hythe, 26th February 1873.
Mr. J. B. Andrews is the only magistrate acting in the borough of Hythe who has favoured me with his opinion on the Bill for the appointment of public prosecutors, copies of which I received from you, and I beg herewith to enclose the letter received from him.

I am, &c.

W. S. SMITH,
Clerk of the Peace for the Borough of Hythe.

From MR. ANDREWS.

DEAR SIR, Stainting Hill, 27th December 1872.
IN September you sent me a copy of a Bill for "the appointment of a public prosecutor," requesting my opinion thereon before the end of the year.
I can only say I think the Bill a very useful one, for in all probability many persons will be prosecuted for offences who would otherwise escape punishment, so many being unwilling to move on account of the trouble and expense.

I am, &c.
JOHN B. ANDREWS.

From MR. HIGGINS.

SIR, Bosbury House, Ledbury, 1st March 1873.
I HAVE had an intimation from the clerk of the peace for Herefordshire, with a copy of your letter, that you would be glad to receive suggestions from magistrates touching the Justices' Clerks and Public Prosecutors Bill ordered to be printed 19th June 1872.

I am a magistrate for the counties of Hereford and Worcester, and have acted for some 40 years in the petty sessional district of Ledbury, in the county of Hereford. At July quarter sessions I proposed a resolution to the court generally approving of the above Bill as amended in committee, and it was carried unanimously. This Bill is a vast improvement upon the last proposed one—more efficient and much more economical. Now for a suggestion or two.

The sixth clause seems, though it is not expressly stated, to contemplate the appointment of a public prosecutor for each county, and then a subordinate one in the respective districts. See also eighth clause. This I think would be a mistake. It would in all probability be a political appointment, would be more expensive and less effective than a district prosecutor. I have ventured to sketch out a clause altering the sixth in that respect, the red ink words showing the alteration. I have no doubt whatever but that the magistrates' clerk will generally be best and most economical public prosecutor for the county districts. Give the clerk a fixed salary to cover his offices both of clerk and public prosecutor. Fix clerk's salary according to population and not according to the money heretofore received.

The table of fees differs in different counties, and some clerks enforce fees more rigidly than others. Abolish all fees as against defendants, and deal with them only by fines and imprisonment. Retain fees in case of complainants, with option of remission.

Magistrates to have power to fine complainant in frivolous and vexatious cases; also to have power to fine both parties in cases of assault, where I have found one party as bad as the other, particularly in women's squabbles.

Police fees in this county I believe are paid over to the Police Superannuation Fund. I see no reason whatever why the police should not provide a superannuation fund for themselves by contributing so much a week, say sixpence, to that object. Therefore I would abolish all police fees, except perhaps in case of complainant.

If parties wish to employ an attorney let them do so at their own expense—in prosecutions.

Make all fines and fees payable to the county rate.

The portion of clerk's salary relating to his public prosecutorship to be defrayed out of Consolidated Fund.

I am sorry my suggestions are somewhat tardy. They ought to have been sent in previous to the 1st of January, according to the intimation I received from the clerk of the peace, which is one reason for my sending them at all, and another is because

your respected brother is a neighbour of mine, when he is at Colwall, where I hear you paid him a visit last year when I was in Germany.

I hope this document does not come too late.

I have, &c.
EDWARD HIGGINS.

Insert as Clause 6.—After this Act has come into operation in any county or borough, the clerk to the special and petty sessions, or the clerk to the justices for each district in each county, shall be public prosecutor, unless the Secretary of State, or the majority of the justices acting for such district shall signify to the Secretary of State their disapproval of such an appointment, and in case of such disapproval it shall be lawful for the Secretary of State to appoint, subject to such recommendation as herein-after mentioned, a fit person, being an attorney-at-law who has practised in such county or borough for not less than three years immediately previous to his appointment, to be a public prosecutor in such county or borough.

From MR. BURTON.

Lincolnshire, Lindsey,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace's Office,
Lincoln, 19th April 1873.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to enclose copy of the report of a committee of magistrates for the parts of Lindsey who were appointed to consider the provisions of the Public Prosecutors Bill, and I am directed to inform you that at the last Easter court of quarter sessions for the parts of Lindsey, in the county of Lincoln, before Sir Charles Anderson, Baronet, chairman, and other justices then and there present, the report was approved and adopted, and an order was thereupon made that a copy of the same should be transmitted for your consideration.

I have, &c.

JOHN FRANCIS BURTON,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

From SIR C. H. J. ANDERSON.

LINCOLNSHIRE.—LINDSEY.

To Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the parts of Lindsey, in the County of Lincoln assembled at the Easter General Quarter Sessions, 1873.

We, the committee appointed at the last Epiphany Sessions to take into consideration the Public Prosecutors Bill as amended in committee, do report as follows:—

That after having carefully considered the provisions of the Bill, we are unanimously of opinion that, so far as the Lindsey Division of this county is concerned, the scheme proposed is absolutely unnecessary, and that any appointments of the officer or officers contemplated would simply involve an useless expenditure, for the following reasons:—

By the present practice the allowance of fees in each case (although small in amount) leads to the attendance of the Bar, and to preparation of a proper brief of the evidence, conducing to the orderly and expeditious management of the business of the court; and therefore we do not consider that the conduct of such prosecutions as occur at our quarter sessions can be rendered more efficient.

We find that during the last year (besides 172 cases which were disposed of under the Criminal Justices Act) there were 121 indictments at the sessions, for which the costs allowed amounted to 1,089*l.* 10*s.* 1*d.*, or an average of 9*l.* in each case, and we cannot think that any alteration which may be made by the proposed Bill can at the same time improve the efficiency and economy of our existing system.

(Signed) C. H. J. ANDERSON.

[*A copy of this Bill and enclosed Memorandum was sent to each of the Judges of the Courts of Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, 28 May 1873.*]

BILL [173.] OF 1873.

A.D. 1873.

A Bill for the appointment of Public Prosecutors and the better Administration of Justice.

BE it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

Preliminary.

Short title.

1. This Act may be cited as the Public Prosecutors Act, 1873.

Extent of Act.

2. This Act shall not extend to Scotland or to Ireland.

Conduct of Prosecutions and Appointment of Public Prosecutors.

Appointment of public prosecutors for conduct of prosecutions by Secretary of State.

3. One of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State (in this Act referred to as the Secretary of State) may from time to time appoint, and, at his pleasure, remove attorneys for the purpose of conducting the prosecution of persons committed (after the expiration of four months after the commencement of this Act) for trial for any of the offences mentioned in the first schedule to this Act, and of instituting and conducting such other criminal proceedings as may be directed by the Secretary of State, or may be prescribed by regulations under this Act, and the attorneys so appointed are in this Act referred to as public prosecutors.

Numbers, salaries, duties, and superintendence of public prosecutors.

4. The Secretary of State, with the concurrence of the Treasury, may from time to time fix the numbers and salaries or other remuneration of public prosecutors.

The Secretary of State may allot to the public prosecutors particular districts, and assign them their duties; and may superintend and issue directions to public prosecutors, and regulate their conduct of prosecutions and other proceedings.

Appointment of solicitor to Home Office.

5. For the purpose of aiding the Secretary of State in the execution of this Act, the Secretary of State may appoint a solicitor to the Home Office.

The Act of the ninth year of King George the Fourth, chapter twenty-five, intituled "An Act to authorise the appointment of persons to act as solicitors on behalf of His Majesty in any court of jurisdiction in revenue matters," shall apply in like manner as if the Secretary of State were therein mentioned in addition to the Commissioners of the Treasury.

The solicitor to the Home Office may, if so directed by the Treasury and Secretary of State, perform any duties and exercise any powers imposed on or vested in the solicitor to the Treasury; and all Acts relating thereto shall be construed accordingly as if such officer were therein substituted for solicitor to the Treasury.

Documents and information to be given to public prosecutors.

6. Where any justices commit any person for trial, and it will be the duty of any public prosecutor to conduct the prosecution of such person, the clerk to the justices, if he is not that public prosecutor, shall forthwith transmit to such public prosecutor the depositions and recognizances in the case, and such other documents and things connected with the case, and give such information in reference to the case as such clerk thinks necessary, or as may be required by the justices or by the public prosecutor.

Where a public prosecutor institutes or conducts any criminal proceeding before justices, the clerk to the justices shall furnish to the public prosecutor, on demand by him, all such depositions, recognizances, documents, and things connected with the case, and give such information in reference to the case as the public prosecutor may require.

The coroner by whom any person is committed for trial shall certify the fact of such committal, and transmit all depositions taken before him, and the recognizances and other documents and things connected with the case, to the proper public prosecutor.

The public prosecutor shall, subject to any regulations made under this Act, deliver or certify the said depositions, recognizances, documents, and things to the proper officer of the court in which the trial is to be had, in the manner in which they would but for this Act be delivered by the justices or clerk to the justices or certified by the coroner, as the case may be.

Any question which may arise with respect to the transmission, furnishing, delivery, or certifying of depositions, recognizances, documents, or things in pursuance of this section shall be decided by a Secretary of State, whose decision shall be final, and shall be observed by all courts and persons.

7. After the expiration of four months after the commencement of this Act, no person shall be bound over by any justices or coroner to prefer a bill of indictment against any person committed for trial for any offence mentioned in the first schedule to this Act. Provision as to private prosecutor.

Any person may be associated in a prosecution with the public prosecutor in such manner and on such conditions as may be prescribed.

Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person of any right of instituting or conducting any proceeding before justices, or of being bound over to prosecute any person who is not committed for trial, or of preferring any indictment.

8. A public prosecutor may, subject to the prescribed regulations, withdraw from any prosecution or proceeding conducted or instituted by him against any alleged offender, if he obtain leave for such withdrawal; the court or justices before whom such prosecution or proceeding is being conducted or instituted, or before whom the offender is committed for trial, or one of Her Majesty's superior courts at Westminster, or any judge thereof, may, if it seem fit, after such notice to the alleged offender, and to the prosecutor (if any) of the offender before the justices, and to such other persons as the court, justices, or judge think fit, grant leave for the withdrawal upon such conditions and subject to such limitations (if any) as may seem just. Withdrawal from prosecution.

The court or judge granting such leave may, if it seem fit, make such order touching the bail or discharge of the alleged offender, and the discharge of the recognizance of any witnesses bound over to appear at the trial of such offender, and touching service of notice of the withdrawal on the offender and witnesses, and such other incidental provisions as to the court or judge may seem necessary or expedient for carrying such withdrawal into effect, and the service of such notice on a witness shall discharge the recognizance of such witness, and relieve him from obeying the subpoena, and such witness shall not be entitled for appearing at the trial in pursuance of such recognizance or subpoena to any sum for costs, expenses, or compensation in respect of anything incurred or done after the receipt of such notice.

9. Where any person has reasonable cause to believe that a public prosecutor is not properly conducting or is not taking the means properly to conduct the prosecution for any offence, or that otherwise it is expedient for the administration of justice that such person should be allowed to prosecute in lieu of the public prosecutor, such person may apply to one of Her Majesty's superior courts at Westminster, or any judge thereof, for leave to conduct the prosecution in lieu of the public prosecutor; and such court or judge, if satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for such application, may, if it seem fit, grant the same upon such conditions and limitations (if any) as to the court or judge may seem expedient for the due administration of justice; and thereupon such person may, subject to the said conditions and limitations (if any), conduct the prosecution in lieu of the public prosecutor, who shall, save as otherwise directed by such court or judge, cease to interfere therein, and shall give to the said person such documents or copies, assistance, and information as such person may reasonably require or the court or judge may direct. Substitution of private prosecutor.

The court before whom any prosecution is conducted by a person in pursuance of leave given under this section may, if the court think fit, order the costs of such prosecution properly incurred to be paid by the public prosecutor, and all costs so paid shall be deemed to be costs of the public prosecutor properly incurred by him in the execution of his duties under this Act.

10. The Secretary of State may from time to time make, revoke, and alter regulations for carrying into effect the provisions of this Act, and in particular— Regulations respecting public prosecutors.

- (1.) For defining and regulating the duties of public prosecutors and the conditions of their office;
- (2.) For regulating the transmission, furnishing, delivery, and certifying of depositions, recognizances, documents, and things to and by public prosecutors;
- (3.) For prescribing or regulating anything authorised by this Act to be prescribed, or to be regulated, provided, or done by regulations under this Act;
- (4.) For revoking and altering any regulations previously made.

A.D. 1873. Such regulations for the time being in force shall be binding on all courts and persons whomsoever.

Such regulations, so far as they involve any expenditure or the control of any expenditure, shall be made with the concurrence of the Treasury.

Expenses and Costs.

Salaries and expenses of public prosecutors.

11. The salaries and remuneration of public prosecutors, together with all costs properly incurred by public prosecutors or any officers appointed by the Secretary of State in the execution of their duties under this Act, shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament.

Exemption of county and borough from payment of costs.

12. After the expiration of four months after the commencement of this Act, so much of any Act as provides that the costs of the prosecution of any person for any of the offences mentioned in the first schedule to this Act, or the costs of any witness for an accused person, or the costs of any witness appearing before justices in the case of a charge of felony or misdemeanor where the person so charged is not committed for trial, or the costs payable to prosecutors and witnesses under the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act, may be ordered to be paid out of or may be charged on or paid out of the county, borough, or other local rate, shall be repealed.

Payment to witnesses.

13. The Secretary of State shall cause an officer appointed for the purpose to pay, unless the court otherwise direct, as soon as practicable, to every witness who appears on recognizance or subpœna to give evidence on behalf of the Crown in any case in which a public prosecutor conducts the prosecution of any offender, and to the prosecutor (if any) of such offender before the justices, and to pay as soon as practicable to every witness who appears on behalf of an accused person, whether prosecuted or not by a public prosecutor, and obtains from the court, under section five of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1867, an order for the payment of his costs, such sum for costs, expenses, and compensation as appears to the officer so appointed for the purpose to be due to such witness or prosecutor under the regulations for the time being in force under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851.

30 & 31 Vict. c. 35.

14 & 15 Vict. c. 35.

The Secretary of State shall cause an officer appointed for the purpose to pay (unless the justices otherwise order), in such cases as may be prescribed by regulations under this Act, to a witness who has been examined before any justices in support of a charge preferred *bonâ fide* and upon reasonable and probable cause for any of the offences mentioned in the first schedule to this Act, but for which no person is committed for trial, such sum for costs, expenses, and compensation as appears to such officer to be due to such witness under the regulations for the time being in force under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851.

If any such witness or prosecutor as aforesaid feel aggrieved by any act of the above-mentioned officer in relation to the payment or nonpayment to him of any such sum, he may apply to the court before whom the person prosecuted was tried or committed for trial, or (in the case of a witness where the person charged was not committed for trial, then) to the court of quarter sessions to which an appeal from the justices before whom such witness appeared lies, and such court may order the payment to the applicant of such sum as the court may think justly due to the applicant, in accordance with the said regulations.

Certificate of costs on summary convictions for larceny, &c.

14. The certificate of the costs payable under the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act to any prosecutor or witness shall be transmitted to such persons and in such manner as may be prescribed, and the amount of such costs when ascertained in the prescribed manner shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament.

Taxation of costs.

15. The Secretary of State may from time to time appoint and remove officers for the purpose of taxing and paying costs payable to prosecutors and witnesses in pursuance of this Act, and of taxing the costs of public prosecutors under this Act.

The number, salaries, and remuneration of such officers shall be such as the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Treasury, may from time to time fix.

Clerks of the Peace and Justices Clerks.—Salaries and Fees.

Payment of clerks by salary under 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. s. 9. made compulsory.

16. Where any of the clerks to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies is not, at the commencement of this Act, paid wholly by salary the local authority shall, within four months after the commencement of this Act, make a recommendation under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, to the Secretary of State as to the payment of such clerk by salary, and the Secretary of State shall make an order

directing such payment; and if, in the case of any such clerk, such recommendation as enables the Secretary of State to make an order under the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, is not received by the Secretary of State before the expiration of the said four months, the Secretary of State shall in like manner in all respects as if such recommendation had been duly made, make an order under the said Act, directing the payment of such clerk by salary in lieu of fees for all his official business which is not excepted by such order, and fixing the amount of such salary.

Every such salary shall be deemed to accrue from day to day, but shall be paid quarterly, or at such less intervals as may be from time to time fixed by the local authority.

Provided that—

- (1.) The salary of any clerk of the peace appointed before the passing of this Act shall not at any time be fixed at any less sum than the average amount, to be proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, of the salary, fees, and other payments and allowances actually received by such clerk, or by him and his predecessor in office, during the three years next before the passing of this Act, in respect of the official business for which such salary is for the time being paid; and
- (2.) Nothing in this section shall prejudice the right of any clerk of the peace to receive any increase of salary or compensation in the event of his being deprived of any house of residence or emoluments other than such fees, payments, or allowances as aforesaid.

This section shall, so far as is consistent with the tenor thereof, be construed as one with sections, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851.

17. With respect to the official fees of any clerk to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies, or of any clerk to whom that section does not apply, and who is clerk of a stipendiary magistrate, or of special and petty sessions or of justices, or in any metropolitan police court, the following provisions shall have effect:—

Making of
table of fees.

- (1.) Every local authority within four months after the commencement of this Act shall submit to the Secretary of State a table of the official fees of any of the said clerks within the jurisdiction of such local authority which they consider should be taken:
- (2.) The Secretary of State shall, as soon as practicable, after the receipt of any recommendation made by a local authority within the said four months, or in default of any such recommendation, after the expiration of the said four months, make a table of the official fees of the said clerks which he considers proper to be taken within the jurisdiction of every local authority:
- (3.) After such table is made, any local authority may at any time recommend a table, and the Secretary of State may from time to time (whether with or without the recommendation of the local authority, but after communication with the local authority, and considering any objections made by them), make a table of official fees of any of the said clerks, by way of alteration of, or addition to, or substitution for any table of official fees then in force; and any table so made shall, so far as it does not supersede the table previously in force, form part thereof:
- (4.) The Secretary of State shall cause copies of every table of fees made in pursuance of this section to be transmitted to the local authority within whose jurisdiction such fees are to be taken; and such copies shall be distributed by such authority among the clerks to whom any such table relates, and shall be affixed and made public in such manner as the authority distributing the same may think best calculated for giving information to the persons who are required to pay such fees, and in such other manner, if any, as the Secretary of State may direct:
- (5.) Every table of fees made in pursuance of this section shall come into operation at such date, not earlier than the date of its transmission to the local authority, as may be fixed by the Secretary of State:
- (6.) After the expiration of six months after the commencement of this Act, or after any earlier date at which a table of fees made in pursuance of this section comes into operation, the fees prescribed by the table for the time being in force in pursuance of this section, and no other fees, whether authorised by or in pursuance of any Act, or otherwise, may be taken as the official fees, or in respect of the official business of the clerks to whom such

A.D. 1873.

table relates; and if any person take or demand any fee contrary to this provision, he shall be liable, on summary conviction before two justices, to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds.

Making of
table of fees
where no
justices, &c.

18. In the case of the clerks in the metropolitan police courts, and in the case of the clerk of any stipendiary magistrate whose fees are paid to the account of Her Majesty's Exchequer, and in any case in which for any cause there is no local authority, the Secretary of State shall make the table of fees, and cause such table to be distributed and made public; and the provisions of this Act relating to such table shall be construed as if there were no reference to such local authority;

Provided that where any body of persons other than the local authority as defined by this Act would, but for the passing of this Act, have power to recommend a table of the official fees of the clerk of any stipendiary magistrate, such body shall, in the provisions of this Act with respect to tables of fees, be substituted for such local authority.

Application
of 23 & 24
Vict. c. 51.
to fees and
return by
clerk.

19. The Act of the session of the twenty-third and twenty-fourth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter fifty-one, intituled "An Act to provide for an annual return of rates, taxes, tolls, and dues levied for local purposes in England," and any Act amending the same, shall apply to the official fees of every clerk, of which a table can be made under this Act, in like manner in all respects as if such fees were dues in the said Act mentioned; and such clerk or the treasurer to any rate or fund to which the official fees of such clerk are payable shall make a return thereof accordingly.

Every clerk whose official fees can be fixed under this Act shall also make any return which the Secretary of State may from time to time require with reference to the duties of the office of such clerk, or matters coming within the cognizance of such clerk by reason of his official business, in such form and with such particulars as the Secretary of State may require; and if he fail to make such return shall be liable to the like penalty as if he had failed to make a return under the said Act.

Miscellaneous.

Provision as
to restitution
of stolen prop-
erty.

20. A conviction of an offender for an offence mentioned in the first schedule to this Act upon a prosecution instituted or conducted by a public prosecutor shall have the same effect for entitling the owner of any property to obtain restitution or restoration of such property as a conviction upon a prosecution instituted or conducted by or on behalf of the owner, unless the court before whom the offender is tried is satisfied that such owner has made default in giving all reasonable information and assistance to the public prosecutor in relation to the prosecution.

The court may grant a certificate of such default, and such certificate shall be a bar to any action, suit, or proceeding by or on behalf of the person so certified to be in default, which otherwise could be maintained or had by him upon the conviction of such offender.

The court may also, in their discretion, order that the property which, but for such default, the court might have ordered to be delivered to the person so in default, shall be delivered to the public prosecutor on behalf of Her Majesty, to be applied as herein-after mentioned.

Recovery of
costs from
convict.

33 & 34 Vict.
c. 23. s. 3.

21. Every person convicted for felony or misdemeanor on a prosecution by a public prosecutor shall be liable to the payment of the costs incurred in or about such prosecution in like manner as if an order condemning him in such costs had been made in pursuance of section three of the Act of the session of the thirty-third and thirty-fourth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter twenty-three, intituled "An Act to abolish forfeitures for treason and felony, and otherwise to amend the law relating thereto;" and the conviction of the offender shall have the same effect as if a judgment for the amount of such costs had been recovered in the Court of Exchequer at the suit of Her Majesty against the offender.

Where any property is shown to have been acquired by the offender by means of the offence for which he has been convicted, and is not restored by an order of the court to any other person, the court before whom the offender is tried may in their discretion order the same to be delivered to the public prosecutor on behalf of Her Majesty.

Any order of a court under this Act for the delivery of property to a public prosecutor shall vest in the public prosecutor and his successors in office on behalf of

Her Majesty all the interest of the offender who is convicted in such property, but shall not prejudice the right of any other person. A.D. 1873.

All property delivered to or vested in a public prosecutor in pursuance of this Act shall be disposed of by him or his successor in office in the prescribed manner, and the proceeds thereof shall be paid into the receipt of Her Majesty's Exchequer, and carried to the Consolidated Fund.

22. Sections twenty-nine and forty of the Act of the session of the second and third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter seventy-one, intituled "An Act for regulating the Police Courts in the Metropolis," (which sections relate to the delivery of possession of goods charged to have been stolen or fraudulently obtained, and to the delivery of goods unlawfully detained, to the owner,) shall apply to the whole of England, in like manner as if they were enacted in this Act, with the omission of all reference to the metropolitan police district, and with the substitution of two justices or a stipendiary magistrate for a justice or magistrate.

Extension of 2 & 3 Vict. c. 71. ss. 29. and 40. to the whole of England.

23. Where a person has been committed for trial, and a bill of indictment has been found against him, and such person is confined in any prison under any sentence, or commitment for trial or otherwise, it shall be lawful for the court before whom such person is committed for trial, or for the Secretary of State, or for a judge of one of Her Majesty's superior courts at Westminster, by warrant to direct the gaoler or other chief officer of such prison to bring up the body of such person, in order that he may be arraigned and tried upon such indictment, and the gaoler shall obey such order, and such person shall be brought up in the like custody, and be dealt with in the like manner in all respects as if a writ of Habeas Corpus for bringing him up had been awarded by one of Her Majesty's superior courts at Westminster.

Bringing up of accused person for trial by order of court, &c. without Habeas Corpus. See 16 & 17 Vict. c. 30. s. 9., 30 & 31 Vict. c. 55. s. 10.

24. A public prosecutor shall not by himself, his partner or clerk, be employed or concerned as an attorney (otherwise than as public prosecutor) in any criminal proceeding other than a proceeding which a Secretary of State may allow as being, in his opinion only, of a quasi-criminal character.

Restriction on private practice of public prosecutor.

25. Nothing in any Act shall be deemed to prevent the clerk to the justices in a borough from acting as a public prosecutor, or subject him to any penalty or disqualification for any act done by him as public prosecutor.

Saving for clerk to justices in boroughs.

26. Nothing in this Act—

- (1.) Shall affect any right of Her Majesty's Attorney General or Solicitor General to institute or conduct any prosecution or proceeding; or any right of Her Majesty's Attorney General or Solicitor General, or any person by his leave, to enter or cause to be entered a nolle prosequi; or
- (2.) Shall exempt any officer of any court, or any constable, from any duty which he may, at the passing of this Act, be liable to perform.

Savings for Attorney General and officers.

And every officer of any court who appears to the Secretary of State to have the duty of taxing at the passing of this Act, either by himself or by others, the costs in prosecutions before any court, shall, until the Secretary of State dispense with his services, continue to give such aid as may be prescribed in taxing the costs payable in pursuance of this Act to prosecutors and witnesses in prosecutions before such court, and the costs of public prosecutors in prosecutions before such court, and in making correct returns of prosecutions before such court.

Every constable shall give such aid and information to a public prosecutor as may be prescribed.

27. Where a reference is made in this Act to a person committed for trial, such reference shall be deemed to refer also to a person who has given bail to appear and take his trial, or to answer to an indictment, or is ordered to be detained in custody until removed for the purpose of his trial, and also, unless the context otherwise require, to a person who has been committed, bailed, or ordered to be detained in consequence of an inquisition before a coroner.

Meaning of "committed for trial."

28. The term "clerk of the peace" in section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, shall include any officer performing the duties of a clerk of the peace, and the terms "clerks of special and petty sessions" and "clerks of justices of the peace" in the said section shall include any officer performing the like duties to any of such clerks; and all references in this Act to clerks to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies shall be construed accordingly.

Explanation of 14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. s. 9.

A.D. 1873.

Interpreta-
tion.

29. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the following terms have the meanings herein-after respectively assigned to them; that is to say,

The term "the Treasury" means the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury:

The term "person" includes a body of persons corporate or unincorporate:

The term "Criminal Justice Act, 1851," means the Act of the session of the fourteenth and fifteenth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter fifty-five, intituled "An Act to amend the law relating to the expenses of prosecutions, and "to make further provision for the apprehension and trial of offenders in certain "cases:"

The term "local authority" means, in relation to any clerk or the fees of any clerk, the justices, council, or other governing body who have power under section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, to make a recommendation with respect to the payment of such clerk by salary in lieu of fees:

The term "official business," used in relation to any clerk, means any business, act, or thing which such clerk, by reason of his office, or in his character of clerk, whether in pursuance of any Act passed before or after the passing of this Act or otherwise, performs or may be called on to perform, or is entitled to take a fee for:

The term "fee" includes any payment or gratuity:

The term "official fee," used in relation to any clerk, means a fee in respect of his official business:

The term "prescribed" means prescribed by regulations made under this Act.

Commence-
ment of Act.

30. This Act shall come into operation on the first day of October one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, which day is in this Act referred to as the commencement of this Act.

Temporary Provisions, and Repeal.

Payment of
costs of
persons com-
mitted for
trial, or in-
curred before
Act in full
operation.

31. The costs of the prosecution of a person who has been tried or committed for trial before the expiration of four months after the commencement of this Act, and the costs of any witness appearing on behalf of any such person, and the costs which have become payable before such expiration, either under the enactments mentioned in the second schedule to this Act, or under any enactment repealed by this Act, shall be paid in like manner as if this Act had not passed, except so far as a Secretary of State may otherwise direct.

Repeal of
Acts in third
schedule.

32. The Acts specified in the third schedule to this Act to the extent specified in the third column of that schedule, and every other enactment fixing or authorising the fixing of fees or a table of fees to be taken by any clerk to whom section nine of the Criminal Justice Act, 1851, applies shall be repealed at the expiration of four months after the commencement of this Act, where they do not relate to Scotland or Ireland absolutely, and in other cases, so far as they relate to England.

Provided that—

(1.) Any fees authorised by any enactment hereby repealed, or any table made thereunder, to be taken by any such clerk, may, until a table of fees made under this Act comes into force with respect to such clerk, continue to be taken as if authorised by a table made under this Act; and

(2.) This repeal shall not affect—

(a.) The payment or recovery of the costs incurred before the said expiration; or,

(b.) Any penalty, forfeiture, or punishment incurred in respect of any offence committed against any enactment hereby repealed; or

(c.) Any investigation, legal proceeding, or remedy in respect of any such fees as are authorised by this section to continue to be taken, or of any such costs, penalty, forfeiture, or punishment as aforesaid; and any such investigation, legal proceeding, and remedy may be carried on as if this Act had not passed.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

A.D. 1873.

OFFENCES.

Any felony.	7 Geo. 4. c. 64. ss. 22, 3.
Attempt to commit any felony.	Do.
Conspiring to charge any person with any felony or to indict any person of any felony.	14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. s. 2.
Conspiring to commit any felony.	Do.
Riot.	7 Geo. 4. c. 64. ss. 22, 3.
Neglect or breach of duty as a peace officer.	Do.
Wilful and indecent exposure of the person.	Do.
Wilful and corrupt perjury or subornation of perjury.	Do.
Any assault in the case of which the justices are of opinion that the same is a fit subject for prosecution or indictment, and bind over the witnesses by recognizance to prosecute and give evidence.	14 & 15 Vict. c. 55. s. 3.
Assaulting or offering violence to any person authorised by 14 & 15 Vict. c. 19. to apprehend any one, or to any person acting in his aid and assistance.	
Any indictable misdemeanor against the Larceny Act, 1861.	24 & 25 Vict. c. 96.
Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-seven, intituled "An Act to consolidate " and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to malicious injuries to property."	
Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-eight, intituled "An Act to consolidate " and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to indictable offences by forgery."	
Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-nine, intituled "An Act to consolidate " and amend the statute law of the United Kingdom against offences relating to the coin."	
Any indictable misdemeanor against the Act of the session of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter one hundred, intituled "An Act to consolidate " and amend the statute law of England and Ireland relating to offences against the person."	
Any indictable misdemeanor in the case of which the expenses of the prosecution on indictment of any person for it are directed by any Act to be paid as in cases of felony.	
Any prescribed misdemeanor.	

SECOND SCHEDULE.

Session and Chapter.	Title or Abbreviated Title.	Enactment referred to.
10 & 11 Vict. c. 82.	An Act for the more speedy trial and punishment of juvenile offenders.	Section fourteen.
13 & 14 Vict. c. 37.	An Act for the further extension of summary jurisdiction in cases of larceny.	Section one.
18 & 19 Vict. c. 126.	An Act for diminishing expense and delay in the administration of criminal justice in certain cases.	Section fourteen.
31 & 32 Vict. c. 116.	An Act to amend the law relating to larceny and embezzlement.	Section two.
34 & 35 Vict. c. 108.	Pauper Inmates Discharge and Regulation Act, 1871.	Section seven.

A.D. 1873.

THIRD SCHEDULE.

Note.—This schedule, so far as respects Acts prior to the forty-first year of the reign of George the Third, refers to the edition prepared under the direction of the Lord Chancellor, intituled “The Statutes Revised Edition.”

A description or citation of a portion of an Act is inclusive of the words, section, or other part first or last mentioned, or otherwise referred to as forming the beginning or as forming the end of the portion comprised in the description or citation.

Portions of Acts which have already been specifically repealed are in some instances included in the repeal in this schedule, in order to preclude henceforth the necessity of looking back to previous Acts.

Session and Chapter.	Title or Abbreviated Title.	Extent of Repeal.
26 Geo. 2. c. 14.	An Act for the settling and ascertaining the fees to be taken by clerks to Justices of the Peace.	The whole Act.
27 Geo. 2. c. 16.	<i>An Act the title of which begins with the words “An Act for making perpetual several laws,” and ends with the words “from riding upon such carriages.”</i>	Section four.
38 Geo. 3. c. 52.	An Act to regulate the trial of causes, indictments, and other proceedings which arise within the counties of certain cities and towns corporate within this kingdom.	Section eight.
57 Geo. 3. c. 91.	An Act to enable Justices of the Peace to settle the fees to be taken by the Clerks of the Peace of the respective counties and other divisions of England and Wales.	The whole Act.
60 Geo. 3. & 1 Geo. 4. c. 14.	An Act to remedy certain inconveniences in local and exclusive jurisdictions.	So much of section three as relates to the expenses of the prosecution and witnesses.
7 Geo. 4. c. 64.	An Act for improving the administration of criminal justice in England.	Sections twenty-two to twenty-seven.
4 & 5 Will. 4. c. 36.	An Act for establishing a new court for the trial of offences committed in the metropolis and parts adjoining.	Section twelve.
5 & 6 Will. 4. c. 76.	An Act to provide for the regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales.	Section one hundred and thirteen, and so much of sections one hundred and twenty-four and one hundred and twenty-five as relates to a table of fees to be taken by a clerk of the peace or clerk to justices.
2 & 3 Vict. c. 15.	An Act to provide for the more effectual execution of the office of a Justice of the Peace within and adjoining to the district called the Staffordshire Potteries, and for purposes connected therewith.	Section nine, down to “public business of the justice acting in pursuance of this Act and.”
2 & 3 Vict. c. 71.	An Act for regulating the Police Courts in the Metropolis.	Section forty-three down to “conspicuous parts of each of the said courts and,” and Schedule A.
2 & 3 Vict. c. 82.	An Act for the better administration of Justice in detached parts of counties.	So much of section two as relates to the costs of prosecution.
5 & 6 Vict. c. 109.	An Act for the appointment and payment of parish constables.	So much of section seventeen as relates to the settling of tables of fees and allowances to the clerks to justices.
6 & 7 Vict. c. 68.	An Act for regulating theatres	Section six.

Session and Chapter.	Title or Abbreviated Title.	Extent of Repeal.
9 & 10 Vict. c. 65.	An Act to provide for the more effectual execution of the office of a Justice of the Peace, and the better administration of the Police within the borough of Wolverhampton, and certain parishes and places in the neighbourhood thereof, all in the county of Stafford.	Section nine.
10 & 11 Vict. c. 82.	An Act for the more speedy trial and punishment of juvenile offenders.	Section fourteen, from "and the amount of expenses of attending," down to "assembled as aforesaid," and from "Provided also that no expenses," to the end of the section; and sections fifteen and sixteen.
11 & 12 Vict. c. 43.	An Act to facilitate the performance of the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions within England and Wales, with respect to summary convictions and orders.	Section thirty.
14 & 15 Vict. c. 19.	An Act for the better prevention of offences.	Section fourteen.
14 & 15 Vict. c. 55.	An Act to amend the law relating to the expenses of prosecutions, and to make further provision for the apprehension and trial of offenders in certain cases.	Sections one to four, and the following words in section nine, namely, "or that all or any of such clerks for the time being paid by salaries be paid by fees in lieu of salary," and also "or to direct that any such clerk for the time being paid by salary be paid by fees in lieu of salary."
16 & 17 Vict. c. 107.	The Customs Consolidation Act, 1853	Section two hundred and ninety-two, and the table of fees therein referred to.
18 & 19 Vict. c. 126.	An Act for diminishing expense and delay in the administration of criminal justice in certain cases.	Section fourteen, from "and every such certificate shall when granted in England," to the end of the section.
20 & 21 Vict. c. 43.	An Act to improve the administration of the law so far as respects summary proceedings before Justices of the Peace.	Section three, from "which fees except such as," down to section thirty; and Schedule A.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 96.	The Larceny Act, 1861	Section one hundred and twenty-one.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 97.	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to malicious injuries to property.	Section seventy-seven.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 98.	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to indictable offences by forgery.	Section fifty-four.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 99.	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of the United Kingdom against offences relating to the coin.	Section forty-two.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 100.	An Act to consolidate and amend the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to offences against the person.	Section seventy-seven.
29 & 30 Vict. c. 52.	An Act to extend the law relating to the expenses of prosecutions, and to make provision for expenses on charges of felony and certain misdemeanors before examining magistrates.	The whole Act.
30 & 31 Vict. c. 35.	The Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1867.	Section five, from "and the amount of such expenses of attending," to the end of the section, and section ten.
32 & 33 Vict. c. 89.	The Clerks of Assize, &c. Act, 1869	Sections ten and eleven.

From MR. BARON BRAMWELL.

SIR,

20, Hans Place, 3rd June 1873.

I THINK section 20 of the Public Prosecutors Bill wrong. It seems to assume that "a *conviction* upon a *prosecution* by the owner of property" is necessary to enable him to recover it. This it not so; a recent decision of the Queen's Bench makes it doubtful if any prosecution by anybody is necessary; certainly it need not be by the owner, and certainly a *conviction* is not necessary. I believe the section might safely be left out; if its substance is retained it should follow the existing statute on the subject, and provide for the issuing of writs of restitution, or an order in a summary way to restore. The next part is wrong. It is not, I suppose, intended to encourage thieves and those who claim under them by letting them keep stolen property if the owner makes default in prosecuting. But this would be the effect of the paragraph, lines 19 to 23 inclusive. If it is said that is set right by the following paragraph, there are two answers. First, it provides that the court may *also*, &c.; therefore they may do the first, but need not do the second. Next, all the court can do is to order property to be *delivered* to Her Majesty. But the property may be eloiigned or consumed. Further, the provision is objectionable on this ground: there is no proportion between the default of the owner and his punishment; the default may be small the value of the property great, or *vice versâ*.

In my last communication to you on this subject I suggested that it should be provided that no action for malicious prosecution should lie against the public prosecutor. I repeat that recommendation for the reasons there given. It is corroborated by the proposed report of a committee of the Judicature Commission, of which I believe you have heard. It is to be remembered that an action would still lie against those who maliciously set the prosecution in motion, or power might be given to the judge trying the case to allow the action, or to the chief public prosecutor.

I am, &c.

G. BRAMWELL.

From MR. MUNBY.

SIR,

York, 13th June 1873.

I VENTURE to solicit the favour of your attention to the 16th section of the Public Prosecutors Bill as it stands now before the House. By the 9th section of the Criminal Justice Act of 1851 the final determining of the amount of salary to the clerks of justices is reserved to the Secretary of State, and by the latter part of the above-mentioned 16th section this function is still continued to you. But the former part of the section is somewhat ambiguous. The local authority are directed to "make a recommendation as to the payment of such clerk by salary." This may be construed to refer to no more than the abstract proposition. If, however, it be construed to include the naming of an amount of salary, then the Secretary of State is commanded to "make an order directing such payment." The control which is so desirable for him to possess over the amount proposed by the local authority is not in words preserved to him. Town councils have no share in the administration of justice, and have, generally, a very imperfect knowledge, and only limited means of acquiring any, respecting the duties of a clerk to justices; and if any gentlemen are now in the Home Office who were there in 1850, they may not have forgotten the absurd manner in which the town council of York dealt with the subject at that time.

I have, &c.

JOSH. MUNBY,

Clerk to the Justices of the City of York.

From MR. WALLIS.

SIR,

7, Mansell Street, Guernsey, 3rd July 1873.

I most humbly beg you will please pardon the liberty I take of addressing you, but having observed that the Crown Prosecutors Act will soon be submitted for Her Majesty's sanction, I respectfully beg you will be pleased to cause this island to be

included in the said Act, being fully convinced there is no part of England and Wales requires such protection more than we do here.

I have, &c.

RICHARD WALLIS.

From MR. RAYNOR.

Town Clerk's Office, Dale Street, Liverpool,

5th July 1873.

SIR,

I AM directed by the finance committee of this council to communicate with you with reference to the position of persons now employed in the conduct of public prosecutions who may cease to be employed upon the passing of this Act.

In Liverpool and two or three other large boroughs the town clerks have for many years past conducted criminal prosecutions by an arrangement with the Lords of the Treasury under which a small fee (2*l.* in Liverpool) is paid for each case, and thereby a very large saving has been effected as compared with the taxed costs allowed to prosecuting attorneys in ordinary cases.

It is probable that most of these officers will be appointed public prosecutors, or otherwise employed in the office of the public prosecutor, but where this is not the case a great hardship would be inflicted upon them if they are not compensated, as many of them have served a great number of years, and might not now be able to obtain any employment of a different kind.

I am directed by the committee to submit the enclosed clause for your consideration, to which they hope Her Majesty's Government will have no objection.

I have, &c.

JOSEPH RAYNOR,

Town Clerk.

CLAUSE submitted on behalf of the Corporation of Liverpool.

WHEREAS in the boroughs of Liverpool criminal prosecutions have heretofore been conducted by the town clerks of the said boroughs by arrangement with the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, and in each of the said boroughs certain persons have been employed under the direction and superintendence of the said town clerks in the conduct of such prosecutions :

Be it enacted that where any such person as aforesaid (other than the town clerks of the said boroughs) is in consequence of this Act deprived of any salary or emoluments, and does not by reason of being appointed a public prosecutor, or otherwise employed under this Act, receive in lieu thereof an equal amount of salary or emoluments, the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury shall award to such person such compensation by way of annuity or otherwise, as having regard to the tenure of his office, the terms and manner of his appointment, the length of his service, the salary and emoluments of any office or employment which he has obtained or had a reasonable opportunity of obtaining, in lieu of the salary or emoluments of which he is so deprived, and to all the circumstances of the case, may to such commissioners seem just. Such compensation shall be paid by the Commissioners of the Treasury as part of the expenses of carrying into execution the provisions of this Act. If at any time the person to whom any such compensation is payable by way of annuity is otherwise employed, or has a reasonable opportunity of being employed, any such annuity shall, to the extent to which the Commissioners of the Treasury may think just, cease to be payable.

From MR. JOHNSON.

67, Preston Street, Faversham,

17th January 1874.

SIR,

I HAVE carefully perused the Bills brought in in 1872 and 1873, and with regard to the latter Bill, I venture with great diffidence to send you certain suggestions on points where I think it requires alteration or amendment. They are of a practical character, and will I hope be found worthy of perusal.

I am, &c.

FREDERIC JOHNSON.

SUGGESTIONS for alteration in the text of the Public Prosecutors Bill as the same was ordered by the House to be printed in May 1873.

Section 3.—It will be necessary, since the passing of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, section 87, that the word “solicitors” be substituted for “attorneys.”

Section 4.—This should be consolidated with section 10; and see my suggestions on that section.

Section 6.—It is suggested that it would be a less radical change and more consonant with the views of the profession in the matter if the present arrangements as to depositions and recognizances were continued in all respects, and that it should be made part of the duties of the clerk to the justices, &c. to forthwith furnish the public prosecutor with correct copies and give such information as may be required by the public prosecutor. In a Bill of the present character it would be as well to avoid as much as possible all unnecessary change, as doubtless there will be great prejudice against a public prosecutor in the first discharge of his duties.

Section 9.—If my suggestion on section 6 is carried out it will prevent any misconception as to what documents are to be handed over to a private prosecutor under this section (9), and would avoid any chance of documents of an important character getting into private hands.

Section 10.—It would be more satisfactory to the profession and the public generally if the justices of the present Court of Queen’s Bench were to concur or assist the Secretary of State in making, altering, and revoking the regulations under this section.

Section 15.—It would be a considerable saving of expense if the clerk of the peace for the county were appointed taxing officer under the Act, and if there be a county solicitor he should also be appointed taxing officer and have equal authority with the clerk of the peace in that respect..

Section 24.—The word “attorney” will here also require altering to “solicitor.”

The Schedules.—In accordance with the suggestion on section 6 the schedules *may* require attention, so far as depositions and recognizances *may* be concerned.

SUGGESTIONS for additional Enactments.

1. The public prosecutor should have a power given him of compelling the attendance, at any place within three miles of the residence, of any person, by a precept under his hand, with the view of examining such person as to any evidence already given before the magistrates, or if he shall be of opinion that such person will be able to give any material evidence for the prosecution; and it would tend greatly to lessen the expense of abortive prosecutions if he were able to exercise this power over the witnesses for the defence also. The regulations should prescribe the form of precept, and provision should be made for the travelling expenses of the public prosecutor or his clerks; and in my opinion no allowance should be made to a witness in respect of such attendance. I feel convinced that without some such power as this it will be very difficult for a public prosecutor to grapple with the difficulties and prejudices attending a new office, and to carry out his duties efficiently.

2. The regulations should prescribe the position the constabulary and borough police are to assume towards the public prosecutor, as he will necessarily have much to do with them in the discharge of his duties, and their respect and co-operation will be invaluable to him. This should not be left to arrange itself.

3. It is presumed the regulations under section 10 will clearly define the costs out of pocket to which a public prosecutor will be entitled beyond his salary, and in calculating such salary it will be necessary to remember that if large districts are taken the public prosecutor will have to employ two, if not three, clerks.

4. Clerks of the peace for town or county, county solicitors, town clerks, clerks to the justices of whatever kind, clerks of assize, and other officials of the like description, should be incapacitated from acting as public prosecutors, and the contrary with the public prosecutors. There are many reasons for this, and, looking at the Government Bill as compared with the one brought in in 1872, it is evident that this principle has been recognised, and it will be well if it be so.

I am quite convinced that the public feeling would be strongly against such officials being appointed.

Faversham, 17th January 1874.

From MR. HOLE.

Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom,
1, Great College Street, Westminster, S.W.,

SIR, 18th April 1874.

I AM directed by the Executive Council of this Association to transmit to you the enclosed Memorial in favour of the appointment of public prosecutors, prepared in accordance with a resolution which was unanimously adopted at the recent annual meeting of the Association. Hoping the subject-matter may meet with your favourable consideration.

I have, &c.

JAMES HOLE.

To the Right Honourable R. A. Cross, M.P., Secretary of State
for the Home Department.

The MEMORIAL of the ASSOCIATION OF CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE of the United Kingdom, of which the following Chambers of Commerce are members :—

Aberdeen, Batley, Belfast, Birmingham, Bradford, Bristol, Cardiff, Coventry, Darlington, Derby, Dewsbury, Dover, Dublin, Dundee, Exeter, Falmouth, Gloucester, Goole, Halifax, Heckmondwike, Holmfirth, Huddersfield, Hull, Jersey, Kendal, Leeds, Limerick, Macclesfield, Middlesbrough-on-Tees, Morley, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Newport, Mon., Northampton, Nottingham, South Shields, Plymouth, Rochdale, Sheffield, Shoreham, Southampton, South of Scotland, Staffordshire Potteries, Stockton-on-Tees, Sunderland, Swansea, Wakefield, West Hartlepool, Wolverhampton and Worcester,

Sheweth,—

That your Memorialists have again had under consideration the desirability of having public prosecutors appointed to take charge of the various cases sent by justices of the peace for trial at the assizes and quarter sessions.

That Bills for carrying the above objects into effect, and which met with the approval of your Memorialists, have, from time to time, been introduced into Parliament during the last four Sessions, but had to be withdrawn in consequence of the pressure of other business.

That in the opinion of your Memorialists justice is often defeated by reason of the mode in which prosecutions under the present system are conducted, and which the appointment of a public prosecutor under proper regulations would obviate.

That in the large towns of Liverpool, Manchester, and Leeds the corporations have appointed public prosecutors, who have been found of great utility.

Your Memorialists therefore urge upon Her Majesty's Government the desirability of introducing a Bill for effecting a change in the mode of conducting prosecutions by the appointment of public prosecutors, and thus remedy the evil complained of.

Signed, on behalf of the Association,

SAMPSON S. LLOYD,
Chairman.

From MR. HOLE.

Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom,
1, Great College Street, Westminster, S.W.,

SIR, 11th September 1874.

ON the 18th April last I had the honour to transmit to you a Memorial from this Association in favour of the appointment of public prosecutors, and received a lithographed circular in reply promising that the subject should be fully considered.

As a meeting of the Association will be held at Newcastle-on-Tyne in a few days our Executive Council would be pleased to be able to place before the delegates the views you hold in reference to the Memorial.

I have, &c.

JAMES HOLE.

From MR. EDGE.

5, St. James' Square, Manchester,
8th October 1874.

MY DEAR SIR,

I HAVE taken the liberty of placing before you my thoughts upon the subject of public prosecutors.

I need not say how glad I should be if the present Government was enabled to carry a satisfactory measure which would settle the question, or how happy I should be to do anything in my power to aid.

I remain, &c.
J. BROUGHTON EDGE.

5, St. James' Square, Manchester,
8th October 1874.

SIR,

As in all probability the subject of the appointment of public prosecutors will shortly be discussed in Parliament, perhaps I may be permitted, as one who has given considerable attention to the matter, to lay my views before you.

From the last Report of the Judicature Commission it would appear that Her Majesty's Government has already given some consideration to the subject, and are desirous of dealing with it if a satisfactory scheme can be devised.

Unfortunately there are very grave objections to both the schemes recommended to Her Majesty, not the least of which is (and this objection is common to both schemes) that the criminal business of the country would be concentrated in the hands of a number of Government appointees to the exclusion of the rest of the profession. To the scheme of the Lord Chief Justice there is the further objection that it would be extremely costly, and I cannot help thinking that this consideration had great weight with the other members of the commission who signed the alternative scheme, inasmuch as the former is beyond doubt the preferable one, if it could be carried out at a reasonable expense. The objections to the latter scheme are, to my mind, much greater than to that of the Lord Chief Justice. The main objection is, that it would place the prosecution of offenders in the hands of the man (above all others) whose interest it *might* be not to be too diligent in the discharge of his duty. The country attorney, who is induced to settle in a country town or large village "in the hope of uniting in " himself the offices of clerk to the justices, to the highway board, to the guardians " of the poor, and so on," and whom it is proposed to make the public prosecutor, is almost invariably the legal adviser of the whole country side, and would be, almost to a certainty, the private solicitor of the man, or of the family of the man, in whose prosecution there is the most danger of an attempted compromise.

Is there not then some middle course which would avoid the objections pointed out? I think there is, and, as briefly as possible, I will endeavour to describe it. But first let us see for what purpose a public prosecutor is required. I take it that he is designed to be an officer of the Crown, whose duty it shall be to see that supposed criminals are duly and properly proceeded against for their alleged offences, that is to say, when a criminal or supposed criminal has been found he is to prosecute him to trial. He may do this either by personally collecting the evidence and personally appearing before the proper court and conducting the prosecution, or he may simply direct and supervise others. If the public prosecutor is personally to conduct each prosecution then it is clear there must be a public prosecutor in each borough, city, and petty sessional division of a county, otherwise the greatest confusion, inconvenience, and expense would be caused owing to the presence of the public prosecutor being required in more places than one at the same time, and the necessity there would be in consequence of frequent adjournments. If he is only required to direct and supervise others, then a single officer in a county (where there is not a dense population), or an officer discharging other duties, would be sufficient.

Now, as stated by the Lord Chief Justice, in the great majority of cases, especially as regards the more common offence of larceny, the proofs are clear and may be collected without difficulty. The evidence is got up, and the witnesses are got together and brought, in the first instance, before the magistrate, and afterwards before the court by the local policeman. The evidence having been given the prisoner is in the first place committed, and the evidence having been repeated on the trial, a verdict of guilty is pronounced, the prisoner receives sentence, and justice is satisfied. In such simple cases as these, therefore, there does not seem to be the slightest necessity for the

intervention of a public prosecutor. And such cases as these, it should be remembered form the *great majority* of cases tried in the criminal courts.

It is only then in the *small minority* of cases that special assistance is required, and the question is, how shall these be dealt with? Are they of sufficient number or importance to require special salaried officers in every petty sessional division in England and Wales? Or may they not rather be dealt with by officers having a wider jurisdiction and a higher status? I think it highly desirable that the public prosecutor should be as far removed as possible from local influences, and therefore that he should be a man of higher status, wider jurisdiction, and should be prohibited from other practice. If there was such an authority, and he was supplied with a roll of the attorneys practising in the criminal courts of each petty sessional division within his jurisdiction, and willing to undertake prosecutions, and such attorneys were required to act upon the direction and under the control of such authority, there can be no doubt these exceptional cases would be efficiently and satisfactorily conducted.

Who, then, should this authority be? He may be a public prosecutor specially appointed, or the duty might be, as has been suggested, put upon the coroner. But in the latter case it would be necessary to deal pretty freely with the status and qualifications of that officer, to qualify and extend his jurisdiction, and probably to re-adjust the boundaries of the various districts in which he now acts. I am inclined to think that eventually this would prove the better course. The coroner seems peculiarly qualified to discharge the functions of a public prosecutor as herein indicated. He is the only *inquiring* officer known to our law who has power to investigate a matter upon oath, and in the absence of a criminal, anciently, too, his power of inquiry extended as well to all felonies as to cases of death, as I believe it does in America to this day. To give him, therefore, the power of inquiry into all crimes would be merely restoring (in part) the authority which he formerly possessed. I would therefore empower him to inquire into all suspected crimes, either alone or with a jury, as might be deemed best, and where there are grounds for charging any individual with a crime require him to direct a prosecution.

But to enable the coroner to discharge the additional duties which I propose to put upon him, it might be advisable, to some extent, to relieve him from the necessity of holding inquests in some cases where he is now obliged to hold them. As is well known, a large proportion of inquests are holden in cases of sudden death. I think it *absolutely* necessary that inquiries should be made in all cases of sudden death without apparent cause. But these inquiries need not necessarily be by inquest. In 99 cases out of 100 a medical examination shows death to have resulted from natural causes, and in every case the verdict is based upon the medical testimony. If, therefore, the coroner was empowered, without first opening an inquest, to order a medical examination of the body, where he considered it necessary, and to decide, upon the medical report of such examination, as to the necessity or non-necessity of an inquest, above one third of the inquests now held might safely be dispensed with. Again, in cases where it was clear that death had arisen in consequence of the acts of a certain individual, and that individual was in custody upon a charge in which the whole facts of the case must necessarily be investigated, an inquest might well be dispensed with, or at any rate held in abeyance. And if the coroner was also the prosecuting authority he would have notice of all such cases, and no conflict of judicial or magisterial authority could possibly arise. Many other minor improvements in the duties and manner of procedure of the coroner might also be effected, which need not be specified here, but which would further tend to make his office a means of freeing the innocent, and handing over the guilty to justice.

This, then, is the modification of the scheme of the Judicature Commission which I would respectfully venture to recommend, *i.e.*, instead of public prosecutors being scattered broadcast through the country, there should be some competent authority, in a county or district, who should simply exercise a supervision over prosecutions, leaving the details to be carried out by the profession at large, or such part of it as might choose to practice in the criminal courts.

The advantages of this plan are:—

- 1st. That it would provide for the efficient supervision of *all* prosecutions, whether before justices, quarter sessions, or at assizes.
- 2nd. That the supervising authority would be a man of standing in the profession, who would devote his whole time to the duties of the office.
- 3rd. That it would allow of the payment to him of a good salary.
- 4th. He would have power to inquire into cases of suspected crime.

5th. He would have power to intervene in any case at any moment, and, whenever required, to procure for the police the assistance of a skilled attorney on the spot.

6th. That the costs of prosecutions would not be materially enhanced, and would be apportioned amongst the profession generally, according to the work done, and not by salaries which might never be earned.

7th. That if the coroner is appointed the supervising authority, it renders the creation of a new office unnecessary.

I agree with the remark of the Lord Chief Justice in his memorandum, that, however small an offence, the prosecution should be "subject to the control, and, if necessary, to the action of a public officer or officers appointed by and responsible to the State." I think, therefore, that a report of every crime committed should be sent to the public prosecutor or coroner of the county or district where committed, with a statement of the steps taken to detect and punish it, and a copy of the depositions (if any) taken in the case. If an ordinary, simple case, he would not, of course, interfere, but if there appeared to be any defect in the proofs, or if there were statements requiring further investigation, or if it was a case necessitating special professional assistance, he would deal with it as necessity required.

I quite agree, too, with the recommendation of the Judicature Commission, that there should be a chief authority in London, who should have power, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State and of Parliament, to make rules for the guidance of the local authorities, and for securing uniformity of practice in the conduct of prosecutions.

Apologising for trespassing upon you,

I am, &c.

J. BROUGHTON EDGE,
Clerk of the Peace.

From MR. NICHOLSON.

Sessions House, Clerkenwell, E.C.,
9th December 1874.

SIR, BY direction of the court of general sessions, holden for this county on the 26th November ultimo, I beg to send to you enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the court upon the subject of the appointment of public prosecutors.

I am, &c.

RICHD. NICHOLSON,
Clerk of the Peace.

MIDDLESEX.—At the general sessions of the peace of our Lady the Queen, holden in and for the county of Middlesex, at the Sessions House for the said county, on Monday the second day of November, in the thirty-eighth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Victoria, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, and from thence continued by several adjournments to and holden at the said Sessions House on Thursday the twenty-sixth day of November, in the said thirty-eighth year of the reign of our said Lady the Queen, and in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-four.

On the motion of Sir J. Heron Maxwell, Bart., duly seconded, it is resolved—

"That in the opinion of the magistrates of Middlesex in quarter sessions assembled, the appointment by the Crown of a public prosecutor in England and Wales will tend to promote the interests and the furtherance of the ends of justice throughout the kingdom."

By the Court,

RICHD. NICHOLSON,
Clerk of the Peace.

LONDON:

Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

609

SUPERIOR COURTS OF COMMON LAW, &c.

RETURN of all FEES received in STAMPS and PAYMENTS formerly charged on the FEE FUND ACCOUNT, SUPERIOR COURTS of COMMON LAW, during the Years ended 31st of March 1874 and 1875; also, RETURN of all RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS in the COURTS of PROBATE and DIVORCE, HIGH COURT of ADMIRALTY, and LAND REGISTRY during the same Period.

(Presented pursuant to Acts 29 & 30 Vict. c. 101, s. 7, and 30 & 31 Vict. c. 122, ss. 1, 2, 5.)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
20 July 1875.*

RETURN of all FEES received in STAMPS and PAYMENTS formerly charged on the FEE FUND

COURTS AND DEPARTMENTS.	RECEIPTS.				Year ended	
	YEAR	YEAR	Increase.	Decrease.	Salaries and Pensions.	Rent, Taxes, &c.
	ended 31 March 1874.	ended 31 March 1875.				
1. QUEEN'S BENCH:	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Masters - - - - -	19,242 16 -	19,907 1 6	664 5 6	- - -	18,025 10 2	595 1 6
Associate - - - - -	2,076 - -	2,050 - -	- - -	26 - -	1,674 11 10	10 8 4
Clerks to the Lord Chief Justice - - - - -	1,240 7 -	295 8 -	- - -	944 19 -	1,500 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Blackburn - - - - -	1,487 10 -	2,247 4 6	759 14 6	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Mellor - - - - -	1,602 - 6	1,906 4 -	304 8 6	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Lush - - - - -	1,374 15 6	1,661 12 -	286 16 6	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Archibald - - - - -	862 16 6	1,300 6 -	437 19 6	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Field - - - - -	- - -	11 17 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Quain - - - - -	915 5 -	1,479 17 -	564 12 -	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Marshals to Judge - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	750 - -	- - -
Messengers, Tipstaves, &c. - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1,384 8 9	- - -
£.	28,791 10 6	30,859 10 -	3,038 18 6	970 19 -	28,334 10 9	605 9 10
2. COMMON PLEAS:						
Masters - - - - -	12,409 10 6	12,607 19 6	198 9 -	- - -	12,148 - -	511 17 6
Associate - - - - -	1,762 - -	1,758 - -	- - -	4 - -	1,643 3 3	10 8 4
Registrar of Judgments - - - - -	928 9 -	996 15 6	68 6 6	- - -	1,199 16 -	50 7 6
Registrar of Certificates - - - - -	2,267 8 6	2,340 11 6	73 3 -	- - -	1,180 13 2	129 11 10
Clerks to the Lord Chief Justice - - - - -	2,014 8 -	573 14 -	- - -	1,440 14 -	1,413 14 -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Grove - - - - -	889 12 -	898 4 -	8 12 -	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Archibald - - - - -	844 18 6	44 19 -	44 3 6	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Keating - - - - -	- - -	643 18 -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Brett - - - - -	997 14 6	1,971 3 6	973 9 -	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Denman - - - - -	1,049 13 -	908 7 -	- - -	141 6 -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Huddleston - - - - -	822 11 -	1,369 8 -	546 17 -	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Justice Honeyman - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	900 - -	- - -
Marshals to Judges on Circuit - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1,234 13 6	- - -
Messengers, Tipstaves, &c. - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
£.	23,786 - -	24,113 - -	1,913 - -	1,586 - -	24,719 19 11	702 5 2
3. EXCHEQUER:						
Masters - - - - -	18,169 11 -	19,039 18 6	870 7 6	- - -	13,781 10 8	780 9 5
Associate - - - - -	2,090 - -	2,173 - -	83 - -	- - -	1,680 - -	10 8 4
Queen's Remembrancer - - - - -	482 6 6	466 1 6	- - -	16 5 -	3,699 13 3	226 2 -
Clerks to Lord Chief Baron - - - - -	813 10 -	733 12 -	- - -	65 12 10	1,500 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Baron Amphlett - - - - -	908 15 6	1,059 15 6	151 - -	- - -	1,218 14 1	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Baron Bramwell - - - - -	2,989 - 6	2,287 13 6	- - -	701 7 -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Baron Pigott - - - - -	829 13 -	1,709 16 6	880 3 6	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Baron Cleasby - - - - -	1,000 17 6	729 2 -	- - -	271 15 6	1,000 - -	- - -
Clerks to Mr. Baron Pollock - - - - -	742 6 6	965 8 6	223 2 -	- - -	1,000 - -	- - -
Marshals to Judges - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	900 - -	- - -
Messengers, Tipstaves, &c. - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1,525 16 8	- - -
Furniture, Stationery, and Sundries, supplied at Judges' Chambers - - - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
£.	28,026 - 6	29,178 13 2	2,207 13 -	1,055 - 4	28,305 14 8	1,016 19 9
The Three Courts jointly						
£.	80,603 11 -	84,151 3 2	7,159 11 6	3,611 19 4	81,497 5 1	2,324 14 9
			Deduct Decrease - - -	3,611 19 4		
			TOTAL Increase - - £.	3,547 12 2		

* These compensations are charged on the Consolidated Fund by the Acts of 1 Will. 4, c. 58; 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 99; 1 Vict. c. 30; and 15 & 16 Vict. c. 73.

ACCOUNT, SUPERIOR COURTS of COMMON LAW, during the Years ended 31 March 1874 and 1875.

P A Y M E N T S.

31 March 1874.			Year ended 31 March 1875.								
Travelling Expenses on Circuit.	Expenses at Chambers and in Offices. Stationery, &c.	Total Payments for Salaries, Pensions, Expenses, &c.	Salaries and Pensions.	Rent, Taxes, &c.	Travelling Expenses on Circuit.	Expenses at Chambers and in Offices. Stationery, &c.	Total Payments for Salaries, Pensions, Expenses, &c.	Increase.	Decrease.		
£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.		
- - -	248 10 3	18,869 1 11	18,516 18 9	595 11 6	- - -	300 11 1	19,413 1 4	543 19 5	- - -		
- - -	40 10 5	1,725 10 7	1,680 - - -	10 12 6	- - -	45 - - -	1,735 12 6	10 1 11	- - -		
- 11 -	41 17 -	1,542 8 -	1,500 - - -	- - -	62 - - -	40 17 -	1,602 17 -	60 9 -	- - -		
26 - -	38 8 -	1,064 8 -	996 15 -	- - -	62 12 -	38 8 -	1,097 15 -	33 7 -	- - -		
- - -	- - -	1,000 - - -	1,000 - - -	- - -	99 13 8	- - -	1,099 13 8	99 13 8	- - -		
61 - -	- - -	1,061 - - -	1,000 - - -	- - -	70 - - -	- - -	1,070 - - -	9 - - -	- - -		
78 - 4	- - -	1,078 - 4	900 - - -	- - -	105 - - -	- - -	1,095 - - -	- - -	73 - 4		
46 4 6	- - -	1,046 4 6	1,000 - - -	- - -	80 - - -	- - -	1,080 - - -	33 15 6	- - -		
- - -	- - -	750 - - -	750 - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	750 - - -	- - -	- - -		
5 - - -	- - -	1,389 8 9	1,536 11 1	- - -	5 - - -	- - -	1,541 11 1	152 2 4	- - -		
216 15 10	369 5 8	29,526 2 1	28,880 4 10	606 4 -	484 5 8	424 16 1	30,395 10 7	942 8 10	73 - 4		
Compensation to holders of abolished offices -		2,199 11 2	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	*2,128 4 -	- - -	71 7 2		
		*31,725 13 3	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	32,523 14 7	- - -	144 7 6		
- - -	191 14 11	12,851 12 5	12,549 5 2	514 5 -	- - -	218 9 6	13,281 19 8	430 7 3	- - -		
- - -	39 9 2	1,693 - 9	1,665 6 11	10 12 6	- - -	47 4 8	1,723 4 1	30 3 4	- - -		
- - -	32 7 8	1,282 11 2	1,199 16 -	50 7 6	- - -	55 1 11	1,305 5 5	22 14 3	- - -		
- - -	47 17 4	1,358 2 4	1,320 2 1	120 - - -	- - -	67 10 8	1,507 12 9	149 10 5	- - -		
35 - -	40 1 3	1,488 15 3	1,500 - - -	- - -	- - -	41 3 5	1,541 3 5	52 8 2	- - -		
45 - -	- - -	1,045 - - -	1,000 - - -	- - -	26 - - -	- - -	1,026 - - -	- - -	19 - -		
135 2 -	- - -	1,135 2 -	250 - - -	- - -	26 - - -	18 4 -	294 4 -	- - -	840 18 -		
61 - -	18 16 6	1,079 16 6	1,850 - - -	- - -	80 13 6	- - -	1,980 13 6	850 17 -	- - -		
70 - -	- 11 6	1,070 11 6	1,000 - - -	- - -	63 16 10	- - -	1,063 16 10	- - -	6 14 8		
42 3 3	- - -	1,042 3 3	983 6 7	- - -	- - -	- - -	983 6 7	- - -	58 16 8		
- - -	- - -	900 - - -	750 - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	750 - - -	- - -	150 - -		
5 - - -	- - -	1,239 13 6	1,470 17 5	- - -	- - -	- - -	1,470 17 5	231 3 11	- - -		
393 5 3	370 18 4	26,186 8 8	25,538 14 2	695 5 -	196 16 4	447 14 2	26,878 3 8	1,767 4 4	1,075 9 4		
Compensation to holders of abolished offices -		1,415 4 7	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	*967 7 4	- - -	447 17 3		
		27,601 13 3	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	27,845 11 -	- - -	1,523 6 7		
- - -	278 19 5	14,840 19 6	13,168 18 7	777 5 9	- - -	290 6 3	14,236 10 7	- - -	604 8 11		
- - -	54 10 6	1,744 18 10	1,686 9 6	10 3 6	- - -	64 10 -	1,761 3 -	16 4 2	- - -		
- - -	177 12 11	4,103 8 2	3,707 14 3	246 6 8	- - -	211 13 6	4,165 14 5	62 6 3	- - -		
61 - -	37 4 6	1,598 4 6	1,500 - - -	- - -	61 - - -	53 - - -	1,614 - - -	15 15 6	- - -		
61 - -	1 7 -	1,281 1 1	1,000 - - -	- - -	60 - - -	- 8 9	1,060 8 9	- - -	220 12 4		
26 - -	39 14 2	1,065 14 2	1,000 - - -	- - -	68 1 6	39 8 -	1,107 9 6	41 15 4	- - -		
119 13 4	15 3 -	1,184 16 4	1,000 - - -	- - -	35 - - -	- 10 -	1,035 10 -	- - -	99 6 4		
61 - -	- - -	1,061 - - -	1,000 - - -	- - -	127 13 10	- 9 -	1,128 2 10	67 2 10	- - -		
70 5 6	- - -	1,070 5 6	1,000 - - -	- - -	70 - - -	- - -	1,070 - - -	- - -	5 6		
- - -	- - -	900 - - -	900 - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	900 - - -	- - -	- - -		
5 - - -	- - -	1,530 16 8	1,517 7 11	- - -	3 15 -	- - -	1,521 2 11	- - -	9 13 9		
- - -	738 18 3	738 18 3	- - -	- - -	- - -	586 11 4	586 11 4	- - -	152 6 11		
403 18 10	1,343 9 9	31,070 3 -	27,480 10 3	1,033 15 11	425 10 4	1,246 16 10	30,186 13 4	203 4 1	1,086 13 9		
Compensation to holders of abolished offices -		1,045 2 5	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	*736 13 7	- - -	308 8 10		
		32,115 5 5	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	30,923 6 11	- - -	1,395 2 7		
- - -	- - -	136 19 9	125 17 1	- - -	- - -	- - -	125 17 1	- - -	11 2 8		
1,013 19 11	2,083 13 9	91,579 11 8	82,025 6 4	2,335 4 11	1,106 6 4	2,119 7 1	91,418 9 7	2,912 17 3	3,073 19 4		
Deduct Increase - - - -									2,912 17 3		
TOTAL Decrease - - £.									161 2 1		

Total amount of payments in the year ended 31 March 1874 for salaries, pensions, compensations, and expenses - - - - - £. s. d.

Total amount of fees received in the same year - - - - - 80,603 11 -

Excess of Payments over Receipts - - - - - £. 10,976 - 8

Total amount of payments in the year ended 31 March 1875 for salaries, pensions, compensations, and expenses - - - - - 91,418 9 7

Total amount of fees in the same year - - - - - 84,151 3 2

Excess of Payments over Receipts - - - - - £. 7,267 6 5

RETURN of the RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS in the COURTS of PROBATE and DIVORCE,

COURTS AND DEPARTMENTS.	R E C E I P T S.				Year ended			
	YEAR	YEAR	Increase.	Decrease.	Salaries.	Incidental Expenses.	Stationery.	Postage.
	ended	ended						
	31 March 1874.	31 March 1875.						
4. COURTS OF PROBATE AND DIVORCE:	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s.	£. s. d.
PRINCIPAL REGISTRY - - - - -	67,637 13 3	66,743 4 3	- - -	894 9 -	41,175 14 6	5,746 12 7	4,007 -	314 17 7 1
DISTRICT REGISTRIES - - - - -	74,207 14 -	74,740 2 6	532 8 6	- - -	41,382 11 2	1,469 14 4		- - - 2
	141,845 7 3	141,483 6 9	532 8 6	894 9 -	82,558 5 8	7,216 6 11		4,007 - 314 17 7 3
5. HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY - -	6,680 5 -	8,298 - -	1,617 15 -	- - -	11,667 2 3	155 16 10	363 -	- - - 4
6. LAND REGISTRY - - - - -	584 16 10	553 11 -	- - -	31 5 10	5,067 17 -	281 4 6	75 -	- - - 5
	£. 149,110 9 1	150,334 17 9	2,150 3 6	925 14 10	99,293 4 11	7,693 8 3	4,385 -	314 17 7 6
Deduct Decrease - - - - -			925 14 10					
Net Increase - - - - - £.			1,224 8 8					

YEAR 1873-74.

COURTS OF PROBATE AND DIVORCE	Total Payments during the Year ended 31st March 1874	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
	Total Fees received - - ditto - - ditto	178,011 11 5	141,845 7 3
	Expenditure over Receipts		36,166 4 2
HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY -	Total Payments during the Year ended 31st March 1874	13,763 11 -	
	Total Fees received - - ditto - - ditto	6,680 5 -	
	Expenditure over Receipts		7,083 6 -
LAND REGISTRY - - - - -	Total Payments during the Year ended 31st March 1874	6,954 7 4	
	Total Fees received - - ditto - - ditto	584 16 10	
	Expenditure over Receipts		6,369 10 6
TOTAL EXPENDITURE OVER RECEIPTS in respect of the COURTS of PROBATE and DIVORCE, the HIGH COURT of ADMIRALTY, and LAND REGISTRY (exclusive of the Salaries of the Judges)		- - £.	49,619 - 8

HIGH COURT of ADMIRALTY, and LAND REGISTRY, during the Years ended 31 March 1874 and 1875.

P A Y M E N T S.												
1 March 1874.			Year ended 31 March 1875.									
Rent, Repairs, &c.	Com- pensations and Super- annuations.	TOTAL.	Salaries.	Incidental Expenses.	Stationery.	Postage.	Rent, Repairs, &c.	Com- pensations and Super- annuations.	TOTAL.	Increase.	Decrease.	
£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
849 3 7 Rates, 608 2 3	75,457 15 5	178,011 11 5	41,482 14 7	5,874 15 11	4,637 -	338 7 8	10,674 3 1 Rates, 584 7 9	72,645 15 2	179,589 19 5	1,578 8 -	-	-
- -			41,852 19 8	1,499 15 7			- -					
457 5 10			83,335 14 3	7,374 11 6			11,258 10 10					
1,287 16 5 97 12 - Rates, 19 3 6	253 - -	13,763 11 -	11,951 19 4	140 14 9	303 -	-	1,421 16 6 Rates, 49 7 8	253 - -	14,119 18 3	356 7 3	-	-
1,168 10 4 316 15 6 Rates, 45 - -							811 1 3 Rates, 49 3 4					
392 3 7	75,710 15 5	198,729 9 9	100,640 10 -	7,530 4 3	5,010 -	338 7 8	13,589 19 7	72,921 5 2	200,030 6 8	1,934 15 3	633 18 4	633 18 4
Deduct Decrease - - -										633 18 4		
Net Increase - - - £.										1,300 16 11		

* Including 1,000 £. consideration money paid for exchange of lease.

YEAR 1874-75.

		£. s. d.	£. s. d.
COURTS OF PROBATE AND DIVORCE	Total Payments during the Year ended 31st March 1875	179,589 19 5	
	Total Fees received - - - ditto - - - ditto	141,483 6 9	
	Expenditure over Receipts	- - -	38,106 12 8
HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY	Total Payments during the Year ended 31st March 1875	14,119 18 3	
	Total Fees received - - - ditto - - - ditto	8,298 - -	
	Expenditure over Receipts	- - -	5,821 18 3
LAND REGISTRY	Total Payments during the Year ended 31st March 1875	6,320 9 -	
	Total Fees received - - - ditto - - - ditto	553 11 -	
	Expenditure over Receipts	- - -	5,766 18 -
TOTAL EXPENDITURE OVER RECEIPTS in respect of the COURTS OF PROBATE and DIVORCE, the HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY, and LAND REGISTRY (exclusive of the Salaries of the Judges)		- - - £.	49,695 8 11

Treasury Chambers,
19 July 1875.

W. H. SMITH.

SUPERIOR COURTS OF COMMON LAW, &c.

RETURN of all Fees received in STAMPS and PAYMENTS formerly charged on the Fee Fund Account, Superior Courts of Common Law, during the Years ended 31 March 1874 and 1875; also, RETURN of all Receipts and Payments in the Courts of Probate and Divorce, High Court of Admiralty, and Land Registry during the same Period.

(Presented pursuant to Acts 29 & 30 Vict. c. 101, s. 7, and 30 & 31 Vict. c. 122, ss. 1, 2, 5.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
20 July 1875.

R E G I S T E R
OF
T E M P O R A R Y L A W S ;

FOR THE
Second Session—XXIST Parliament of the United Kingdom
of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND.

(38 & 39 VICTORIA, 1875.)

*(Presented pursuant to the Report of the Select Committee on Expiring Laws
in Session 1866.)*

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
5 July 1875.*

CONTENTS.

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE - - - - p. 3

INDEX :—

CLASS I.—TEMPORARY LAWS the Duration of which is certain, unless so far as
they depend on the Sitting of Parliament - - - - p. 15

CLASS II.—TEMPORARY LAWS the Duration of which is uncertain - - - - p. 17

GENERAL INDEX - - - - - p. 18

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS

NOW IN FORCE.

Matter.	Date.	Ch.	When passed.	Title of the Act.	Duration.
1. BANK of ENGLAND INCORPORATION.	5, 6 W. & M. 20, § 20. 21. 8, 9 W. 3. 20, § 26. 27. N. B.—Clauses for continuing this Corporation in successive Loan Acts down to 19, 20 Vict. 21. 35, 36 Vict. 34.	7 Nov. 1693. 5 June 1856. 18 July 1872.	For granting to their Majesties several Rates and Duties upon Tonnage of Ships and Vessels, and upon Beer, Ale, and other Liquors; for securing certain Recompences and Advantages, in the said Act mentioned, to such Persons as shall voluntarily advance the Sum of £.1,500,000. towards the carrying on the War against France. Bank continued as a Corporation - - - As to re-election of Directors. Note.—As to the Bank of England Privileges, see No. 3.	Till payment of Sums due to the Bank, and Redemption of all Bank Annuities created by Parliament.	
2. BANK of IRELAND.	Acts of the Parliament of Ireland. 21, 22 Geo. 3. 16. amended by 31 Geo. 3. 22. 37 Geo. 3. 50. Acts of the United Parliament. 48 Geo. 3. 103. 1, 2 Geo. 4. 72. 1, 2 Vict. 81. 3, 4 Vict. 75. 8, 9 Vict. 37.	1781. 21 July 1845.	For establishing a Bank, by the Name of The Governor and Company of the Bank of Ireland. Bank of Ireland continued as a Corporation, and may be dissolved,	After 1 January 1855, on Twelve Months' Notice, and repayment of Debt due from the Public to the Bank.	

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
3. BANK OF ENGLAND PRIVILEGES.	3, 4 W. 4. amended by 7, 8 Vict. 8, 9 Vict. ,, and see as to s. 7. 17, 18 Vict.	98. 32. 37, s. 6. 38, s. 15. 90.	29 Aug. 1833.	For giving to the Corporation of the Governor and Company of the Bank of England certain Privileges for a limited Period, under certain Conditions. <i>Note.</i> —Sec. 6 seems permanent.	Determinable on 12 Months' Notice, after 1 August 1855, and on Repayment of the Debt due from the Public to the Bank.	
4. COAL TRADE (PORT OF LONDON).	1, 2 Will. 4. continued 8, 9 Vict. and amended 24, 25 Vict. continued 26, 27 Vict.	lxxvi. 101. 42. 46.	Local. 22 July 1861. 13 July 1863.	For regulating the Vend and Delivery of Coals in the Cities of London and Westminster, and in certain Parts of the Counties of Middlesex, Surrey, Kent, Essex, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Berkshire.	5 July	1882
5. CIVIL LIST.	1, 2 Vict. amended 1, 2 Vict. 15, 16 Vict.	2. 92. 39.	23 Dec. 1837.	For the Support of Her Majesty's Household, and of the Honour and Dignity of the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland	Six Months after the Death of Her Majesty.	
6. POOR RATES, STOCK IN TRADE EXEMPTION.	3, 4 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	89. 76.	10 Aug. 1840. 7 Aug. 1874.	To exempt Inhabitants of Parishes, Townships, and Villages from liability to be rated as such, in respect of Stock in Trade or other Property, to the Relief of the Poor, until - - -	31 December	1875
7. SURVEY of GREAT BRITAIN.	4, 5 Vict. amended 33 Vict. continued 38, 39 Vict.	30. 13. 32.	21 June 1841. 12 May 1870. 29 June 1875.	To authorise and facilitate the Completion of a Survey of Great Britain, Berwick-upon-Tweed, and the Isle of Man.	31 December and no longer.	1885

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
8. HIGHWAY RATES.	4, 5 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	59. 76.	22 June 1841. 7 Aug. 1874.	To authorise the Application of a Portion of the Highway Rates to Turnpike Roads, in certain Cases.	31 December	1875
9. COURTS MARTIAL (East Indies).	7, 8 Vict.	18.	6 June 1844.	To remove Doubts as to the Power of appointing, convening, and confirming the Sentences of Courts Martial in the East Indies.	Continues. so far as regards Officers and Soldiers in Her Majesty's Service, during the continuance of any Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, &c.	
10. ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION.	10, 11 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	98. 76.	22 July 1847. 7 Aug. 1874.	To amend the Law as to Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in England. As to certain Provisions.	31 December	1875
11. COPYHOLD, INCLOSURE, and TITHE COMMISSIONS.	4, 5 Vict. 14, 15 Vict. 25, 26 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	35. 53. 73. 76.	1841. 7 Aug. 1874.	To consolidate and continue the Copyhold and Inclosure Commissions, and to provide for the Completion of Proceedings under the Tithe Commutation Acts. Temporary as to appointment of Commissioners, &c.	31 December	1875
12. EPISCOPAL and CAPITULAR ESTATES MANAGEMENT.	14, 15 Vict. amended 17, 18 Vict. 22, 23 Vict. 23, 24 Vict. 31, 32 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	104. 116. 46. 124. 114, s. 10 76.	8 Aug. 1851. 11 Aug. 1854. 7 Aug. 1874.	To facilitate the Management and Improvement of Episcopal and Capitular Estates in England. <i>Note.</i> —This Act is applied by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 94 (s. 19), which is a permanent Act.	31 December	1875

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>
13. CORRUPT PRACTICES PREVENTION ACT, 1854.	17, 18 Vict. 21, 22 Vict. 26, 27 Vict. 31, 32 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	102. 87. 29. 125. 76.	10 Aug. 1854. 8 June 1863. 31 July 1868. 7 Aug. 1874.	To consolidate and amend the Laws relating to Bribery, Treating and undue Influence at Elections of Members of Parliament.	31 December 1875
14. ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS.	31, 32 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	125. 76.	31 July 1868. 7 Aug. 1874.	For amending the Laws relating to Election Petitions, and providing more effectually for the Prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections.	31 December 1875
15. MUTINY ACT (Army).	38 Vict.	7.	22 April 1875.	For punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better Payment of the Army and their Quarters. Continuance: In Great Britain - - - - Ireland, Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, Sark, and Isle of Man Gibraltar, the Mediterranean, Spain, and Portugal - - - Elsewhere in Europe, and in the West Indies and America - India, Cape of Good Hope, Isle of France, or Mauritius, St. Helena, and Settlements on the Western Coast of Africa, from the 1st January 1875 to the British Columbia and Van Couver's Island, from the date of the promulgation thereof in General Orders to - - - - Elsewhere, from 1 Feb. 1877 to the	24 April 30 April 31 July 31 August 1 January 1 January 1 February 1876 1877 1877 1878
16. MUTINY ACT (Marine Forces).	38 Vict.	8.	22 April 1875.	For the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on Shore. Continuance: In Great Britain - - - - Ireland, Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney, Sark, and Isle of Man Gibraltar, Mediterranean, Spain, and Portugal - - - - Elsewhere in Europe, and the West Indies, North America, and Cape of Good Hope - Elsewhere - - - -	25 April 1 May 1 August 1 Sept. 1 February 1876 1877

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
17. MILITIA BALLOTS SUSPENSION.	28, 29 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	46. 76.	19 June 1865. 7 Aug. 1874.	To amend the Laws relating to the Ballots for the Militia in England, and to suspend the making of Lists and Ballots for the Militia of the United Kingdom.	31 December	1875
18. TURNPIKE ACTS. (G. B.)	37, 38 Vict.	95.	7 Aug. 1874.	To continue certain Turnpike Acts in Great Britain, to repeal certain other Turnpike Acts, and for other purposes connected therewith. Acts in 1st Schedule repealed after - - - Acts in 2nd Schedule - - - - - Acts in 3rd Schedule repealed on and after - Act in 4th Schedule, various dates on and after Acts in 5th Schedule, various dates on and after Act in 6th Schedule, various dates on and after Act in 7th Schedule - - - - - Acts in 8th Schedule - - - - -	1 November 31 December 1 November 31 December 1 July 1 November 1 November 1 November and END of then NEXT SESSION.	1874 1874 1874 1874 1874 1877 1875 1875
19. SALMON FISHERY ACT, 1861.	24, 25 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	109. 76.	6 Aug. 1861. 7 Aug. 1874.	An Act to amend the Laws relating to Fisheries of Salmon in England. As to offices of Inspectors of Fisheries, s. 31. Office of Special Commissioners discontinued by Act 36 Vict. c. 13.	31 December	1875
20. SALMON FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) ACT AMENDMENT.	25, 26 Vict. amended 26, 27 Vict. 27, 28 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	97. 50. 118. 76.	2 Aug. 1862. 7 Aug. 1874.	To regulate and amend the Law respecting the Salmon Fisheries of Scotland. As to powers of Commissioners, &c.	31 December	1875

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.						
<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
21. PROMISSORY NOTES.	26, 27 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	105. 76.	28 July 1863. 7 Aug. 1874.	To remove certain Restrictions on the Negotiation of Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange under a limited Sum.	31 December	1875
22. MALT FOR ANIMALS.	27, 28 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	9. 76.	28 April 1864. 7 Aug. 1874.	To allow the making of Malt Duty Free to be used in Feeding Animals.	31 December	1875
23. MALT DUTY.	28, 29 Vict. amended 29, 30 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	66. 64. 76.	29 June 1865. 7 Aug. 1874.	To allow the Charging of Excise Duty on Malt according to the Weight of the Grain used.	31 December	1875
24. ENDOWED SCHOOLS (Vested Interests).	31, 32 Vict. continued 38, 39 Vict.	32. 29.	25 June 1868. 29 June 1875.	For annexing Conditions to the Appointment of Persons to Offices in certain Schools.	31 December	1879
25. ENDOWED SCHOOLS (Schemes).	32, 33 Vict. amended and continued 36, 37 Vict. 37, 38 Vict.	56. 87. 87.	2 Aug. 1869. 5 Aug. 1873. 7 Aug. 1874.	To amend the Law relating to Endowed Schools and other Educational Endowments in England, and otherwise to provide for the Advancement of Education. As to period within which the powers of making and approving Schemes may be exercised, and as to Salaries of additional Charity Commissioners.	31 December	1879

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
26. PUBLIC SCHOOLS.	27, 28 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	92. 76.	29 July 1864. 7 Aug. 1874.	For annexing Conditions to the Appointment of Persons to Offices in the Governing Bodies of certain Public Schools and Colleges.	31 December	1875
27. LOCOMOTIVES ON ROADS.	28, 29 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	83. 76.	5 July 1865. 7 Aug. 1874.	For further regulating the use of Locomotives on Turnpike and other Roads for Agricultural and other Purposes.	31 December	1875
28. PROSECUTION EXPENSES.	29, 30 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	52. 76.	23 July 1866. 7 Aug. 1874.	To extend the Law relating to the Expenses of Prosecutions, and to make Provision for Expenses on Charges of Felony and certain Misdemeanors before Examining Magistrates.	31 December	1875
29. CHESTER COURTS.	30, 31 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	36. 76.	15 July 1867. 7 Aug. 1874.	To authorise the Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the Borough and City of Chester, and County of the same City, and the Portmote and Pentice Courts for the City of Chester, to be held at the Castle of Chester, and to confer additional Powers upon the Sheriff of the County of Chester, in exoneration of the Sheriff of the City of Chester. Temporary as to Sections 1, 2, and 3. - -	31 December	1875

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.						
<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
30. MASTER AND SERVANT.	30, 31 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	141. 76.	20 Aug. 1867. 7 Aug. 1874.	To amend the Statute Law as between Master and Servant.	31 December	1875
31. SEA FISHERIES.	31, 32 Vict.	45.	13 July 1868.	To carry into effect a Convention between Her Majesty and the Em- peror of the French, concerning the Fisheries in the Seas adjoining the British Islands and France, and to amend the Laws relating to British Sea Fisheries. Sect. 4. So much of Act as applies to French Subjects to cease on determination of Treaty.	Ten years from a day to be fixed after passing of Act (13 July 1868), and so on from year to year until notice by either of Contracting Parties to determine Convention.	
32. ELECTION COMMIS- SIONERS' EXPENSES.	32, 33 Vict. amended 34, 35 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	21. 61. 76.	24 June 1869. 31 July 1871. 7 Aug. 1874.	To amend the Law relating to the Payment of the Expenses of Com- missioners of Inquiry into Corrupt Practices at Elections of Members to serve in Parliament.	31 December	1875
33. PARLIAMEN- TARY AND MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.	35, 36 Vict.	33.	18 July 1872.	To amend the Law relating to Pro- cedure at Parliamentary and Muni- cipal Elections.	31 December and no longer.	1880
34. RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC.	36, 37 Vict. 37, 38 Vict.	48. 40.	21 July 1873. 30 July 1874.	To make better Provision for carrying into effect "The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854," and for other Purposes. Temporary as to Part II.	21 July and END of then NEXT SESSION.	1878

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
35. LINEN, HEMPEN, COTTON and other MANU- FACTURES (Ireland).	5, 6 Will. 4. amended 3, 4 Vict. 5, 6 Vict. 7, 8 Vict. 30, 31 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	27. 91. 68. 47. 60. 76.	21 Aug. 1835. 10 Aug. 1840. 15 July 1867. 7 Aug. 1874.	To continue and amend certain Regu- lations for the Linen and Hempen Manufactures in Ireland. For the more effectual Prevention of Frauds and Abuses committed by Weavers, Sewers and other Persons employed in the Linen, Hempen Union, Cotton, Silk, and Woollen Manufactures in Ireland, and for the better Payment of their Wages, for One Year, and from thence to the End of the then next Ses- sion of Parliament.	31 December	1875
36. OATHS, UNLAWFUL (Ireland). [Unlawful Societies.]	2, 3 Vict. amended 11, 12 Vict. continued and amended 38 Vict.	74. 89. 14.	24 Aug. 1839. 31 Aug. 1848. 28 May 1875.	To extend and render more effectual an Act [4 Geo. 4, c. 87] to amend an Act [50 Geo. 3, c. 102] for preventing the administering and taking unlawful Oaths in Ireland.	1 June	1880
37. LUNATIC ASYLUMS (Ireland).	5, 6 Vict. amended 34 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	123. 22. 76.	12 Aug. 1842. 25 May 1871. 7 Aug. 1874.	For amending the Law relating to Private Lunatic Asylums in Ireland.	31 December	1875
38. LANDED PROPERTY IMPROVE- MENT (Ireland).	10 Vict. amended 12, 13 Vict. 13, 14 Vict. 25, 26 Vict. 29, 30 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	32. 59. 31. 29. 40. 76.	8 June 1847. 7 Aug. 1874.	To facilitate the Improvement of Landed Property in Ireland. As to Powers of Commissioners - - -	31 December	1875
39. PRESERVA- TION OF THE PEACE (Ireland).	19, 20 Vict. amended 20, 21 Vict. 28, 29 Vict. 33 Vict. 34 Vict. 36 Vict. continued and amended 38 Vict.	36. 7. 118. 9. 25. 24. 14.	30 June 1856. 3 July 1857. 5 July 1865. 4 April 1870. 16 June 1871. 26 May 1873. 28 May 1875.	For the better Preservation of the Peace in Ireland.	1 June	1880

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.						
<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
40. PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY IN CERTAIN PARTS OF IRELAND.	34 Vict. Part I., temporary. amended and continued 38 Vict.	25. 14.	16 June 1871. 28 May 1875.	To empower the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland to apprehend and detain for a limited time persons suspected of being members of the Ribbon Society, or of being concerned in the commission of any crime or outrage under the direction or influence of the said Ribbon Society in the county of Westmeath, or in certain adjoining portions of the county of Meath and the King's County; and to continue "The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1870."	1 June	1877
41. COUNTY CESS, IRELAND.	11, 12 Vict. amended 20, 21 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	32. 7. 76.	22 July 1848. 3 July 1857. 7 Aug. 1874.	To facilitate the Collection of County Cess in Ireland.	31 December	1875
42. SHEEP, CATTLE, &c. DISEASES.	11, 12 Vict. extended 16, 17 Vict. amended 29 Vict. 33, 34 Vict. 35, 36 Vict. 37, 38 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	107.* 62.* 4.† 36.† 16. 6. 76.	4 Sept. 1848. 21 May 1874. 7 Aug. 1874.	To prevent the spreading of contagious or infectious Disorders among Sheep, Cattle, and other Animals. * Repealed except as to Ireland by 32 & 33 Vict. c. 70 (Contagious Diseases, Animals), a permanent Act. † Applies to Ireland only.	31 December	1875
43. DWELLINGS FOR LABOURING CLASSES (Ireland).	23, 24 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	19. 76.	15 May 1860. 7 Aug. 1874.	To extend the Act to facilitate the Improvement of Landed Property in Ireland, and the Acts amending the same, to the Erection of Dwellings for the Labouring Classes in Ireland.	31 December	1875

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
44. PROMISSORY NOTES AND BILLS OF EXCHANGE (Ireland).	27, 28 Vict. continued 37, 38 Vict.	20. 76.	13 May 1864. 7 Aug. 1874.	To remove certain Restrictions on the Negotiation of Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange under a limited Sum in Ireland.	31 December	1875
45. IRISH CHURCH.	32, 33 Vict.	42.	26 July 1869.	To put an end to the Establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make Provision in respect of the Temporalities thereof, and in respect of the Royal College of Maynooth. Temporary as to Office of Commissioners, &c.	25 July and END of then NEXT SESSION.	1879
46. JURIES (Ireland).	36, 37 Vict. amended 37, 38 Vict. continued 38, 39 Vict.	27. 28. 37.	16 June 1873. 30 June 1874. 29 June 1875.	To amend the Law relating to Juries in Ireland.	11 January	1877
47. LANDLORD AND TENANT (Ireland).	33, 34 Vict. amended 35, 36 Vict.	46, s. 3 32.	1 Aug. 1870. 18 July 1872.	To amend the Law relating to the Occupation and Ownership of Land in Ireland. Temporary as to part of Sect. 3, "Compen- sation in absence of custom."	1 January	1891
48. GLEBE LOANS (IRELAND).	33, 34 Vict. continued 34, 35 Vict. amended and continued 38, 39 Vict.	112. 100. 30.	10 Aug. 1870. 21 Aug. 1871. 29 June 1875.	To amend 1 & 2 Will. 4, c. 33, and to afford facilities for the Erection, Enlargement, and Improvement of Glebe Houses, and for the Acquire- ment of Lands for Glebes in Ireland. Temporary [except s. 9] - - - -	31 August	1878
49. EDUCATION (Scotland).	35, 36 Vict.	62.	6 Aug. 1872.	To amend and extend Provisions of the Law of Scotland on the Subject of Education. As to continuance of Board of Education -	6 August or by Order in Council for a further period, not more than two years.	1875

REGISTER OF TEMPORARY LAWS NOW IN FORCE.

<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Ch.</i>	<i>When passed.</i>	<i>Title of the Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>	
50. PETROLEUM.	34,35 Vict. continued 37,38 Vict.	105. 76.	21 Aug. 1871. 7 Aug. 1874.	For the safe keeping of Petroleum and other Substances of a like nature.	31 December	1875
51. SUNDAY OBSERVANCE PROSECU- TIONS.	34,35 Vict. continued 37,38 Vict.	87. 76.	17 Aug. 1871. 7 Aug. 1874.	To amend the Law with respect to Prosecutions for Offences against the Act 29 Charles II. c. 7, intituled, "An Act for the better Observation of the Lord's Day commonly called Sunday."	31 December	1875
52. POLICE EXPENSES.	37,38 Vict.	58.	7 Aug. 1874.	To make further provision respecting the Contribution out of Moneys provided by Parliament towards the Expenses of the Police Force in the Metropolitan Police District and elsewhere in Great Britain.	1 September	1875
53. MILITARY MANŒUVRES.	38 Vict.	34.	14 June 1875.	For making provision for facilitating the Manœuvres of Troops to be assembled during the present Summer. As to Occupation of Land - - - - - As to Compensation for Damage - - - - -	1 September 1 June and no longer.	1875 1876

INDEX OF TEMPORARY LAWS.

CLASS I.

TEMPORARY LAWS

THE DURATION OF WHICH IS CERTAIN, UNLESS SO FAR AS THEY DEPEND
ON THE SITTING OF PARLIAMENT.

The ACTS having this mark, * are continued to the Date set against them, and to the End of the then next Session.

<i>Page.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date of last continuing Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>
7	Turnpike Acts (G. B.) - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 95 -	{ Various dates from 1 November 1874 to 1 May - - 1882
6	Mutiny (Army) - - - -	38 Vict. c. 7 - -	22 April - - 1875
6	Mutiny (Marine Forces) - - - -	38 Vict. c. 8 - -	22 April - - 1875
13	Education (Scotland) - - - -	35, 36 Vict. c. 62 -	6 August - 1875 (or by Order in Council two years longer).
14	Military Manœuvres - - - -	38 Vict. c. 34 - -	1 September 1875
14	Police Expenses - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 58 -	1 September 1875
6	Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices at Elections - - - - }	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
13	Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange (Ireland) - - - - }	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
6	Corrupt Practices Prevention Act (1854) -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
10	Election Commissioners' Expenses - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
8	Malt Duty - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
9	Chester Courts - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
9	Prosecution Expenses - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
8	Promissory Notes - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
5	Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commissions	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
8	Endowed Schools (Vested Interests) - -	38, 39 Vict. c. 29 -	31 December 1879
11	Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
9	Public Schools (Appointments) - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
12	County Cess (Ireland) - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
5	Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
11	Linen, Hempen, &c. Manufactures (Ireland)	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
8	Endowed Schools (Schemes) - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 87 -	31 December 1879

CLASS I.—TEMPORARY LAWS THE DURATION OF WHICH IS CERTAIN, &c.—*continued.*

<i>Page.</i>	<i>Matter.</i>	<i>Date of last continuing Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>
10	Master and Servant - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
12	Sheep and Cattle (Diseased) (Ireland) - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
8	Malt for Animals - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
9	Locomotives on Roads - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
14	Sunday Observance Prosecutions - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
11	Landed Property Improvement (Ireland) -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
12	Dwellings for Labouring Classes (Ireland) -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
5	Episcopal and Capitular Estates Management	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
7	Militia Ballots Suspension - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
7	Salmon Fishery, 1861 - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
4	Poor Rates, Stock in Trade Exemption -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
5	Highway Rates (England) - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
7	Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act Amendment	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
14	Petroleum - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1875
13	Juries (Ireland) - - - - -	38, 39 Vict. c. 37 -	11 January - 1877
13	Glebe Loans (Ireland) - - - - -	33, 34 Vict. c. 112 -	31 August - 1878
12	Protection of Life and Property (Ireland) -	38 Vict. c. 14 -	1 June - - 1877
10	Railway and Canal Traffic - - - - -	36, 37 Vict. c. 48 -	21 July - - 1878*
13	Irish Church - - - - -	32, 33 Vict. c. 42 -	25 July - - 1879*
11	Oaths, Unlawful (Ireland) [Unlawful Societies]	38 Vict. c. 14 -	1 June - - 1880
11	Peace Preservation (Ireland) - - - - -	38 Vict. c. 14 -	1 June - - 1880
10	Parliamentary and Municipal Elections -	35, 36 Vict. c. 33 -	31 December 1880 and no longer.
4	Coal Trade (Port of London) - - - - -	26, 27 Vict. c. 46 -	5 July - - 1882
4	Survey of Great Britain - - - - -	37, 38 Vict. c. 76 -	31 December 1885 and no longer.
13	Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) - - - - -	33, 34 Vict. c. 46, s. 3	1 January - 1891

N.B.—By 48 Geo. 3, c. 106, if a Bill is introduced for the continuance of any Act which would expire in the same Session, and such Act shall expire before the Bill for continuing the same receives the Royal Assent, the continuing Act takes effect from the expiration of the former Act, but not so as to affect any person with any penalty in the interval.

CLASS II.

TEMPORARY LAWS

THE DURATION OF WHICH IS UNCERTAIN.

<i>Page.</i>	<i>Name.</i>	<i>Date of last continuing Act.</i>	<i>Duration.</i>
3	Bank of England Incorporation.	19, 20 Vict. c. 21 -	-- Till Payment of Sums due to the Bank, and Redemption of all Bank Annuities created by Parliament.
4	Bank of England Privileges.	3, 4 Will. 4, c. 98 -	-- Determinable on 12 Months' Notice after 1st August 1855, and on Repayment of Debt due from the Public to Bank.
3	Bank of Ireland -	8, 9 Vict. c. 37 - -	-- May be dissolved after 1 January 1855 on 12 Months' Notice, and Repayment of Debt due from the Public to the Bank.
4	Civil List - - -	1, 2 Vict. c. 2 - -	Six Months after the Death of Her Majesty.
5	Courts Martial (East Indies).	7, 8 Vict. c. 18 - -	-- During the continuance of any Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, &c.
10	Sea Fisheries - - (Convention with Emperor of the French).	31, 32 Vict. c. 45 - So much of Act as applies to French Subjects, on determination of Convention, to cease, s. 4.	-- Convention to continue in force for 10 years from a day to be fixed after passing of Act (13 July 1868), and so on from year to year until Twelve Months' Notice by either of the Contracting Parties to determine the same.

I N D E X

OF THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE ACTS CONTAINED IN
THIS REGISTER.

The * signifies that the Act relates *exclusively* to Ireland.

	Page.		Page.
BANK of England - - - -	3, 4.	Malt Duty - - - - -	8.
* — of Ireland - - - -	3.	Malt for Animals - - - -	8.
Chester Courts - - - -	9.	Master and Servant - - -	10.
Civil List - - - - -	4.	Military Manœuvres - - -	14.
Coal Trade (Port of London) - -	4.	Militia Ballots Suspension - -	7.
Copyhold Commission - - -	5.	Mutiny Act (Army) - - -	6.
Corrupt Practices Prevention, 1854 -	6.	———— (Marine Forces) - -	6.
* County Cess - - - - -	12.	* Oaths, Unlawful (Unlawful Societies)	11.
Courts Martial (East Indies) - -	5.	Parliamentary and Municipal Elec- tions. - - - - -	10.
* Dwellings for Labouring Classes -	12.	* Preservation of the Peace - - -	11.
Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction - - -	5.	Petroleum - - - - -	14.
Education (Scotland) - - - -	13.	Police Expenses - - - - -	14.
Election Commissioners' Expenses -	10.	Poor Rates, Stock in Trade Exemption	4.
Election Petitions and Corrupt Prac- tices at Elections. - - - -	6.	Promissory Notes - - - - -	8.
Endowed Schools (Vested Interests)	8.	* Promissory Notes and Bills of Ex- change. - - - - -	13.
Endowed Schools (Schemes) - - -	8.	Prosecution Expenses - - - -	9.
Episcopal and Capitular Estates Ma- nagement. - - - - -	5.	* Protection of Life and Property -	12.
* Glebe Loans - - - - -	13.	Public Schools (Appointments) -	9.
Highway Rates - - - - -	5.	Railway and Canal Traffic - - -	10.
Inclosure Commission - - - -	5.	Salmon Fishery, 1861 - - - -	7.
Irish Church - - - - -	13.	Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) - - -	7.
* Juries - - - - -	13.	Sea Fisheries - - - - -	10.
* Landed Property Improvement -	11.	* Sheep and Cattle (Diseased) - -	12.
* Landlord and Tenant - - - -	13.	Survey of Great Britain - - -	4.
* Linen, Hempen, and other Manufactures	11.	Sunday Observance Prosecutions -	14.
* Lunatic Asylums - - - - -	11.	Tithe Commission - - - - -	5.
Locomotives on Roads - - - -	9.	Turnpikes - - - - -	7.
		* Unlawful Societies - - - - -	11.

R E G I S T E R

OF

T E M P O R A R Y L A W S .



*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
6 July 1875.*

635

VACCINATION ACT, 1867.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 5 March 1875;—for,

“RETURN of the Number of PROSECUTIONS in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under ‘THE VACCINATION ACT, 1867,’ distinguishing,—

- (1.) Those who under SECTION 29 have neglected to procure the Vaccination of a Child;
- (2.) Those who under SECTION 31 have disobeyed the Order of a Justice for the Vaccination of a Child;

“Stating, also, the Amount of Penalty Inflicted on Conviction; whether Imprisoned in case of Default; and, if Discharged under Section 31, the Grounds for such Discharge:—

Name of Petty Session or Police Court.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of “The Vaccination Act, 1867.”				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of “The Vaccination Act, 1867.”				
	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty Inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty Inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.

(Mr. James.)

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
6 August 1875.

RETURN of the Number of PROSECUTIONS in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1873, under "THE VACCINATION ACT, 1867," distinguishing,—(1.) Those who under SECTION 29 have neglected to procure the Vaccination of a Child; (2.) Those who under SECTION 31 have disobeyed the Order of a Justice for the Vaccination of a Child; stating, also, the Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction; whether Imprisoned in case of Default; and, if Discharged under Section 31, the Grounds for such Discharge.

Note.—The Returns from all Petty Sessions where Prosecutions are shown to have taken place are printed. Those in which no Prosecutions are shown are omitted.

COUNTY PETTY SESSIONAL DIVISIONS.

C O U N T Y AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
E N G L A N D : BEDFORD : Amphill Division	1872 -	B. C.	-	-	-	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-
	1873 .	G. J. G. L.	- 1	- Paid.	- -	-	-	-	-	-
		G. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H. F.	-	2 6	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-
	1870 -	J. A. G. C. W. S. H. R. J. J. C. C. G. W. R. B. C. F. L. L. T. A.	- 2 6 2 6 - - - - - 2 6 - -	No. No. No. - - - - No. - -	- - - - - - - - - -	Withdrawn on pay- ment of expenses, - Withdrawn on pay- ment of expenses. Withdrawn : costs remitted by the Justices.	- - - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - - -	
	1871 -	W. B. J. A. C. S. B. J. L. P. W. C. A. G. J. M. F. B. G. H.	- 5 5 5 - 1 - - -	No. No. No. No. - No. - -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	

[illegible]

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1876, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
BUCKS—continued. First Division of the Hundred of Burnham (exclusive of the Chesham Division).	1870 -	G. S.	£. s. d. - - 6	No.	-	-	£. s. d. - - -	-	-	-	
	1871 -	W. C.	- - 6	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	G. W.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	P. D.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
Chesham Division of the Hundred of Burnham	1870 -	T. A.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	W. J.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	T. R.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	W. S.	- - -	Certificate produced to the effect that child was not in a fit state of health to be vaccinated.			-	-	-	-	
Second Division of the Hundred of Burnham	1871 -	W. O. H.	- 5 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	D. T.	- 5 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	J. P.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	C. K.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
Second Division of the Hundred of Desborough	1871 -	H. B.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	J. K.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	W. L.	- - -	-	Adjournd sine die.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	J. L.	- - -	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
Second Division of the Hundred of Desborough	1871 -	T. S.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	W. S.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	J. G.	5 s., and 13 s. costs.	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	C. W.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
Second Division of the Hundred of Desborough	1871 -	E. T.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	A. E.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	G. S.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	J. H.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
Second Division of the Hundred of Desborough	1870 -	22 persons.	2 s. 6 d. each	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	2 persons.	10 s. each	One committed for seven days.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	1 person	- 5 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	1 person	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Second Division of the Hundred of Desborough	1871 -	10 persons.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1872 -	H. R.	- 5 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Division	Year	Name	Age	Sex	Status	Remarks	Penalty paid.	Information drawn.	Yes	No	Costs	Remarks	Penalty paid.	Information drawn.
Linslade Division	1870	J. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. T. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		D. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Three Hundreds of Newport (exclusive of the Stony Stratford Division)	1871	J. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. I.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. N.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CAMBRIDGE: Arrington and Melbourn Division	1873	E. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bottesham Division	1874	J. P. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caxton Division	1874	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* But paid the fine and costs as soon as he entered the gaol.

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.			Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."						
	Year.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
CAMBRIDGE--continued. Ely Division, in the Isle of Ely	1872 -	M. D.	£. s. d.	-	-	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-
		J. N.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. T.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	W. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. G. C. H.	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Division of the Liberties of Whittlesey and Thirney, in the Isle of Ely.	1870 -	J. S.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CHESTER:														
Altrincham Division	1873 -	J. H.	No conviction, ordered to pay 10 s. costs.	No	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bucklow East Division	1873 -	W. W.	- 10 -	Penalty paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	W. W.	1 -	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hyde Division	1872 -	- None -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	J. S.	Order made to have child vaccinated.	-	-	-
						-	-	-	-	W. B.	-	-	-	-
Leftwich Division						D. S.	Order made to have child vaccinated.	-	-	-	Order made to have child vaccinated.	-	-	-
						J. S.	20 s. and costs.	-	-	-	20 s. and costs.	-	-	-
						J. S.	20 s. and costs.	-	-	-	20 s. and costs.	-	-	-
	1871 -	J. P.	10 s. costs.	No	Discharged on payment of costs, the children having been vaccinated since issue of summonses.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B. M. D. J. P. M. M.	4 s. 6 d. costs. 4 s. 6 d. costs. 4 s. 6 d. costs. 6 d. fine, and 12 s. 6 d. costs.	No No No No	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -
1873 -	J. M. R. D.	5 s., and 8 s. 6 d. costs. 6 d., and 21 s. costs.	Fine paid. - ditto.	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

C O U N T Y AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.		Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
			Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
DERBY—continued. Chapel-en-le-Frith Division, held at Sudbury	1870 -	-	S. C. - W. T. for A. E. T.	- 1 - 1 - -	- Paid. Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1871 -	-	- None -	-	-	-	W. T. for R. P. T.	1 - -	Paid.	-	-
	1873 -	-	U. W. G. - W. T. for R. R. T.	- 10 - - 10 -	- Paid Paid.	-	H. E. K. - J. L. - N. S. - S. S. - H. E. K. - A. M. - C. S. - W. T. for A. E. T. W. T. for R. P. T. W. T. for L. T.	- 10 - - 1 - - 10 - - 1 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 -	Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid.	-	-
	1870 -	-	- None -	-	-	-	J. L. - J. L. - M. W. - J. L. -	1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - -	14 days. 14 days. 14 days. 14 days.	-	-
	1871 - 1873 - 1874 -	- - -	- None - - None - - None -	- - -	- - -	-	J. L. - J. L. - J. B. - J. B. - A. M. - J. L. - J. L. -	1 - - 1 - - - 5 - 1 - - - 5 - - 10 - - 10 -	7 days. 14 days. 7 days. 14 days. 14 days. 14 days. 14 days.	-	-
Derby Division	1872 -	-	- None -	-	-	-	A. F. - G. S. -	1 - - 1 - -	No. No.	-	-
	1873 -	-	- None -	-	-	-	T. T. - G. B. -	1 - - - 10 -	No. No.	-	-
	1874 -	-	- None -	-	-	-	J. B. -	1 - -	No.	-	-
	1874 -	-	H. E. - R. K. -	1 - - 1 - -	- Paid. Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Great Torrington Division		1874 -	-	R. E. -	- 1 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
DEVON:											
Cullompton Division		1874 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Year	Division	Member	Age	Religion	Marital Status	Children	Education	Occupation	Notes
1871	Paignton Division, held at Torquay	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	Paignton Division, held at Torquay	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	Paignton Division, held at Torquay	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1870	South Roborough Division	C. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. A.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		I. G. S. Y.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. C. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		L. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1871	Stanborough and Coleridge Division, held at Kingsbridge and Totnes.	J. N.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. U.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. E.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	Teignbridge Division, held at Newton Abbot	J. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874	Teignbridge Division, held at Newton Abbot	J. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1871	Teignbridge Division, held at Newton Abbot	J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	Teignbridge Division, held at Newton Abbot	M. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
DEVON—continued. Teignbridge Division, held at Teignmouth	1872	W. H.	£. s. d. - 5 6	No.	Discharged.	-	£. s. d. -	-	-	-	
		T. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		W. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871	W. B.	- 6	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-	
		1872	G. W.	1	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	
			W. K.	1	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	
	1874	J. L.	1	No.	No.	-	-	-	-		
		J. C.	3 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	DORSET: Wimborne Division	1871	C. S.	6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	
J. P.			3	No.	-	-	-	-	-		
M. C.			3	No.	-	-	-	-	-		
C. K.			3	No.	-	-	-	-	-		
1870		S. B.	10	No.	-	-	-	-	-		
		J. A.	10 s. and costs	No.	On paying costs.	-	-	-	-		
1871		M. P.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
		C. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
DURHAM: Durham Ward Division		1871	W. B.	To pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
			W. N.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	W. P.		Fined 10s. and costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	R. H.		To pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	1870	R. C.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		T. A.	Fined 5s. and costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	1871	J. V.	-	-	Discharged; child died after service of summons.	-	-	-	-		
		J. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
	1871	F. M'C.	Fined 5s. and costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
		J. H.	To pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
1871	R. N.	-	-	Discharged; child died after service of summons.	-	-	-	-			
	M. C.	To-pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-			

[illegible]

North Division of Easington Ward, held at
Houghton-le-Spring.

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of <i>England</i> and <i>Wales</i> since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.— <i>cont'd.</i>				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					
C O U N T Y AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."						Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."	
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
DURHAM— <i>continued.</i> Seaham Harbour, Division of Easington Ward - South Division of Easington Ward - - -	1874	R. S.	£. s. d.	-	Discharged.	-	£. s. d.	-	-
	1870	P. S.	- 16 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1871	T. C.	- 6 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. D.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. S.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. G.	- - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. C.	- - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	- - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. C.	- 10 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. R.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. E.	- 7 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		B. B.	- 10 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. H.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. M'G.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		O. B.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. C.	- 10 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. H.	- 12 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. K.	- 7 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. S.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. H.	- 1 8 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	J. F.	- 2 6	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	- - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. P.	- 8 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. S. C.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. L. B.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. D.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	- 6 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. R.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. E.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. J. W.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. H.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. W.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. O.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		D. Q.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. P.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. D.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. G.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. F.	- 4 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874	W. H.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. S.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. L.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. P. T.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-

Discharged.

M. F.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
H. B.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 5 s. and costs.
T. W.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
H. H.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
T. J.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
T. J.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
A. E. W.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
T. W.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
T. H.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
J. B.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
E. C.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
M. F.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 5 s. and costs.
W. H. C.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
I. J.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
R. K.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
A. W.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
A. B.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
T. W.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
R. B.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
J. M.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
R. W.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
T. L.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
S. G.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
E. B.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 5 s. and costs.
T. O.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
G. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-
J. A.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
G. S. G.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
J. H. G.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
E. B. S.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
W. H.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
J. T. H.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
R. M.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
A. W.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
M. F.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
T. B.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
A. W.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
G. S.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
W. W.	-	-	-	-	-	Fined 20 s. and costs.
W. H. C.	-	-	-	-	-	To pay costs.
W. B.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
F. G.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
J. M.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
J. H. G.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
A. W.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
G. S. G.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
E. B. S.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
R. M.	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*cont'd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867,"				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867,"			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
DURHAM— <i>continued.</i> South Eastern Division of Darlington Ward— <i>continued.</i>	1872 -	J. D.	£. s. d. To pay costs -	-	-	J. M.	£. s. d. Fined 10 s. and costs.	-	-
		J. D.	ditto.	-	-	A. W.	ditto.	-	-
		G. S.	ditto.	-	-	A. W.	ditto.	-	-
		M. F.	To pay costs.	-	Discharged.	G. S. G.	ditto.	-	-
		A. W.	ditto.	-	-	T. B.	ditto.	-	-
		J. M.	ditto.	-	-	J. S.	ditto.	-	-
		J. M.	ditto.	-	-	G. S.	ditto.	-	-
		B. M. L.	To pay costs.	-	Discharged.	R. M.	ditto.	-	-
		E. B. S.	ditto.	-	-	J. H. G.	ditto.	-	-
		G. S. G.	ditto.	-	-	E. B. S.	ditto.	-	-
		W. W.	-	-	-				
		W. B.	-	-	-				
		J. D.	-	-	-				
		R. M.	To pay costs.	-	-				
		J. S.	ditto.	-	-				
North West Division of Darlington Ward	1873 -	J. H. G.	Fined 20 s. and costs.	-	Discharged.	M. F.	Fined 10 s. and costs.	-	-
		W. P.	-	-	-				
		W. B.	To pay costs.	-	-				
		M. F.	ditto.	-	-				
		J. M.	ditto.	-	-				
		W. P.	-	-	-				
		J. W.	Fined 20 s. and costs.	-	-				
		J. L.	ditto.	-	-				
		C. T.	Fined 1 s. and costs.	-	-				
		G. P. R.	1 -	No	No.				
Middle Division of Chester Ward	1870 -	E. H.	To pay costs.	-	-				
		R. G.	1 -	No	No.				
		J. G.	-	No	Yes.				
		H. G.	2 6	No	No.	G. H.	- 10 -	No	No.
		J. R.	-	-	-				
1871 -	1871 -	J. S. A.	6	-	No.				
		J. M.	-	-	No.				
		W. E.	- 11 -	No	No.	G. H.	1 -	No	No.
		W. A.	- 7 6	No	No.	W. E.	1 -	No	No.
		T. H.	- 11 -	No	No.	T. H.	1 -	No	No.
		R. W.	- 11 -	No	No.	G. B.	1 -	No	No.
		W. B.	-	No	No.				
		E. S.	- 11 -	No	No.				
		J. C.	-	No	No.				

[illegible]

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
ESSEX— <i>continued.</i> Rochford Division	1872	G. M.	£. s. d. - 1 -	No	No.	-	£. s. d. -	-	-
		W. B.	- 6 -	No	No.	-	-	-	-
		H. B.	Prosecution withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. K.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	J. G.	- ditto.	-	-	G. J. P.	Prosecution withdrawn.	-	-
Tendring Division, held at Mistley	1871	T. B.	Prosecution withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. R. G. (1st child).	10 s., and 8 s. costs.	14 days' hard labour.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. R. G. (2nd child).	- ditto	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. R. C. (1st child.)	Child vaccinated after summons taken out.	-	Yes, on payment of expenses.	-	-	-	-
	1873	J. R. C. (2nd child).	- ditto	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
Walden Division	1871	A. H.	1 s. fine, and 8 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. H.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. H.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. C.	6 d. fine, and 8 s. costs.	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
	1870	J. C.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
Witham Division	1872	S. T.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		A. S.	- 6 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		A. S. B.	Not convicted.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. S. B.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	G. W.	- 2 6 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
Walden Division	1871	S. C.	Not convicted.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		W. C.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
	1873	M. M.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	J. C.	1 - -	Paid.	-
Witham Division	1872	J. M.	Not convicted.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. A. L.	- 10 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		A. P.	Not convicted.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	W. B.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
Walden Division	1871	H. N.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		H. H.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
		W. C.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-
	1873	M. M.	- 1 -	No	Paid.	-	-	-	-

Year	Name	Age	Sex	Status	Remarks	J. C.	Paid.	Discharged	Child had been successfully vaccinated.
1874	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	J. T. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874	J. T. L.	-	-	-	Order granted.	-	-	-	-
1871	W. A. N.	-	-	-	10 s. fine, and 8 s. costs.	-	-	-	-
	W. B. R.	-	-	-	ditto	-	-	-	-
	J. S.	-	-	-	1 s. fine, and 8 s. costs.	-	-	-	-
	S. H.	-	-	-	Vaccinated after service of summons.	-	-	-	-
	E. S.	-	-	-	10 s. fine, and 8 s. costs.	-	-	-	-
	R. P.	-	-	-	Vaccinated after service of summons.	-	-	-	-
	H. M.	-	-	-	10 s. fine, and 8 s. costs.	-	-	-	-
	E. W.	-	-	-	ditto	-	-	-	-
	H. E. M.	-	-	-	ditto	-	-	-	-
1873	None	-	-	-	-	H. E. M.	Ordered, and afterwards fined 20 s. and 12 s. costs for disobedience.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	E. W.	Ordered, and afterwards fined 20 s. and 8 s. costs.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	W. A. N.	ditto	-	-
		-	-	-	-	W. B. R.	Ordered.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	ditto.	-	-
1874	None	-	-	-	-	W. D.	Ordered, and afterwards fined 20 s. for disobedience.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	E. B.	Ordered.	-	-
1870	15 persons	-	-	-	18 s. each, including costs.	-	-	-	-
	13 persons	-	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-
1871	1 person	-	-	-	7 s. 4 d., including costs.	-	-	-	-
1872	1 person	-	-	-	10 s., including costs.	1 person	-	-	-
	1 person	-	-	-	17. 14 s. 3 d., including costs.	-	-	-	-

Winstree and Lexden

GLOUCESTER:

Cheltenham Division

Chrencaster Division

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
GLOUCESTER— <i>continued.</i> Gloucester Division	1872 -	C. J. S.	£. s. d. - 10 -	-	-	-	£. s. d. - - -	-	-
	1873 -	W. G. C.	- 6 -	-	-	-	- - -	-	-
		H. M.	- 2 6	-	-	-	- - -	-	-
	1874 -	G. H.	- 1 -	-	-	-	- - -	-	-
	1871 -	G. B. C.	- - -	-	Discharged.	-	- - -	-	-
Horsley Division	1871 -	E. T.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
	1873 -	H. H.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
Lawford's Gate Division	1870 -	W. C.	- - -	-	Settled on payment of costs.	-	- - -	-	-
		T. G. H.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		G. S.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		S. P.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		H. H. J.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		W. C.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		J. P. S.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		F. M.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		W. J.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		A. C.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		J. C.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		T. H.	- - -	-	Withdrawn.	-	- - -	-	-
		J. D. B.	- - -	-	Settled.	-	- - -	-	-
		W. P.	- - -	-	Settled on payment of costs.	-	- - -	-	-
1871 -		E. S.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		W. P.	- - -	-	Withdrawn.	-	- - -	-	-
		P. S.	- - -	-	Settled.	-	- - -	-	-
		G. B. H.	5 s. and costs	Paid	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		J. D.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		J. L.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		G. R.	- - -	-	Dismissed.	-	- - -	-	-
		W. B.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		M. B.	- - -	-	Withdrawn.	-	- - -	-	-
		J. L.	- - -	-	Dismissed.	-	- - -	-	-
1872 -		W. T. J.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		A. R.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		I. L.	- - -	-	Withdrawn.	-	- - -	-	-
		E. J. B.	- - -	-	Dismissed.	-	- - -	-	-
		G. G.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		T. T.	- - -	-	Settled.	-	- - -	-	-
1873 -		H. S.	- - -	-	ditto.	-	- - -	-	-
		C. F.	- - -	-	Dismissed.	-	- - -	-	-
		E. H.	- - -	-	Settled.	-	- - -	-	-
1873 -		J. C.	- - -	-	Dismissed.	-	- - -	-	-
		D. P.	- - -	-	Settled.	-	- - -	-	-
		G. B.	- - -	-	Dismissed.	-	- - -	-	-

Year	Division	Name	Age	Costs	Discharged on undertaking to have children inspected after vaccination.	Discharged on undertaking to have children vaccinated.	Discharged on promising to have children vaccinated.	Costs	No.
1870	Newent Division	H. B.	1	20 s. and costs	No	No	No	Costs 8 s. 6 d.	No.
1872	Newent Division	E. B.	1	2	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	J. P.	1	2	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	F. C.	2	2	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Newent Division	A. T.	5	5	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	W. E. S.	5	5	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	W. J.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	J. C.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	J. P.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	G. H.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	R. B.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	N. M.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	J. S.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	B. W.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	R. B.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	J. C.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	M. C.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	G. B.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	W. J.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	J. R.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Newent Division	H. H.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Newent Division	J. H.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Newent Division	W. C.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Newent Division	H. C.			No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Newent Division	W. G.	1	1	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1871	Tewkesbury Division	H. C.	5	5	No	No	No	Costs 8 s. 6 d.	No.
1873	Tewkesbury Division	P. L.	5	5	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Tewkesbury Division	L. K.	5	5	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Tewkesbury Division	J. S.	5	5	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1873	Tewkesbury Division	H. W.	5	5	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1870	HEREFORD: Weobley Division	W. M.	6 d., and 8 s. costs.	6 d., and 8 s. costs.	No	No	No	Costs 8 s. 6 d.	No.
1873	HEREFORD: Weobley Division	E. D.	6 d., and 8 s. costs.	6 d., and 8 s. costs.	No	No	No	ditto	No.
1870	HEREFORD: Dacorum Division, held at Berkhamstead (St. Peter).	None	None	None	No	No	No	Penalty 5 s.; costs, 9 s. 6 d.	No.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

C O U N T Y AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
HERTFORD—continued. Dacorum Division, held at Berkhamstead (St. Peter)—continued.	1871 -	- None -	£. s. d.	-	-	J. P.	Penalty, 1 l.; costs, 14 s. 6d.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	H. S.	Penalty, 10 s.; costs, 14 s. 6d.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. L.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. G.	-	-	Yes	Forgiven.
		-	-	-	-	H. B.	-	-	Yes	- ditto.
		-	-	-	-	J. B.	-	-	Yes	- ditto.
		-	-	-	-	H. S.	Costs, 13 s. 6d.	No.	-	Suspended to produce certificate.
		-	-	-	-	H. S.	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	Costs, 8 s. 6d.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	H. B.	Costs, 14 s.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	I. W.	Costs, 8 s. 6d.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	W. M.	Costs, 14 s.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	H. S.	Penalty, 2 s. 6d.; costs, 10 s.	No.	-	-
	1872 -	-	-	-	-	H. S.	- ditto -	-	-	See above. Certificate not produced.
		-	-	-	-	W. M.	Penalty, 10 s.; costs, 14 s. 6d.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	W. S.	-	-	Yes	Forgiven.
		-	-	-	-	J. B.	Penalty, 1 l.; costs, 10 s.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	H. B.	Penalty, 1 l.; costs, 16 s. 6d.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	Penalty, 1 l.; costs, 10 s.	No.	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	- ditto -	No.	-	-
1873 -	-	-	-	-	H. S.	- ditto -	No.	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	H. S.	- ditto -	No.	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	H. S.	- ditto -	No.	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	H. B.	Penalty, 1 l.; costs, 11 s. 6d.	No.	-	-	
	-	-	-	-	H. T. B.	Costs, 8 s.	No.	Yes	Defect in service of notice.	

[illegible]

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
KENT—continued. Rochester (North Division of the Lath of Aylesford).	1870 -	F. E.	£. s. d. - 1 -	No.	-	C. W. N.	£. s. d. - 10 -	Yes.	-	-
		A. H.	- 2 6	No.	-	C. W. N.	- 1 -	Yes.	-	-
	1871 -	M. S.	- 6 4	No.	-	C. W. N.	- 1 -	Yes.	-	-
		C. P.	- 5 -	No.	-	F. J. L.	- 4 -	No.	-	-
		F. W. G.	- 2 -	No.	-					
		C. P.	- 1 -	No.	-					
	1872 -	C. W. N.	- 2 6	Yes.	-					
		J. B.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		A. C.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		J. S.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		J. D. A.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		R. B.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		J. C.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		J. J. B.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		F. J. S.	- 1 -	No.	-					
Sevenoaks Division -		C. F.	- 2 6	No.	-					
		J. W.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		J. W. B.	- 5 -	No.	-					
		R. B.	- 5 -	No.	-					
		E. A.	- 2 -	No.	-					
	1873 -	C. P.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		J. W. B.	- 1 -	No.	-					
		F. H.	- 10 -	No.	-					
		F. H.	- 10 -	No.	-					
		C. W. N.	- 1 -	Yes.	-					
1874 -	C. P.	- 1 -	No.	-						
	S. J.	- 1 -	No.	-						
	S. J. W.	- 1 -	No.	-						
	1870 -	B. R.	- 1 -	No.	-					
1871 -	N. W.	- 1 -	No.	-						
	J. S.	- 1 -	No.	-						
Tonbridge Division of Lower South Aylesford	1870 -	T. W.	-	-	Yes.					
	1871 -	G. T.	-	No, penalty being paid.	-					
		F. H.	-	-	Yes, on payment of costs.					

[illegible]

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

[illegible]

Year	Division	Name	Costs	Notes	Outcome	Settlement	Remarks
1871	Ashton-under-Lyne Division	J. F. B.	Fined 5s, costs 8s.		Paid.		
1872		A. M.	Fined 5s, costs 8s.		Paid.		
		T. F.	- ditto		Paid.		
		J. B.	Fined 20s, costs 10s.		Paid.		
1873		J. B.	Fined 20s, costs 15s.		Paid.		
1874		C. B.	Fined 20s, costs 10s.		Paid.		
1873	Bolton Division	-	None		-		Paid.
1871	Bury Division	J. W.	10s, 6d, and costs.		No.		
		J. L.	-		-		Dismissed.
		A. S.	20s, and costs		No.		
		R. T.	10s, and costs		No.		
1872		H. H.	20s, and costs		No.		
1870	Manchester Division (which includes the petty sessions at Heaton Norris and Worsley).	J. B.	5s, and costs		Paid.		Withdrawn.
		M. A.	-		-		
		J. S. S.	5s, and costs		Paid.		
		G. H.	- ditto		Paid.		
		E. P.	-		-		Withdrawn.
		M. M.	5s, and costs		Paid.		
		E. P.	-		-		Settled.
		P. C.	5s, and costs		Paid.		
		T. W.	Pay costs		Paid.		
		G. H.	20s, and costs		Paid.		
		J. J.	10s, and costs		Paid.		
		A. C.	5s, and costs		Paid.		
		H. T. J.	20s, and costs		Paid.		
1872		R. R. B.	-		-		Dismissed.
1873		C. T.	10s, and costs		Paid.		
		R. R. B.	20s, and costs		Paid.		
		D. Y.	1s, and costs		Paid.		
		R. R. B.	10s, and costs		Paid.		
1874		E. S.	5s, and costs		Paid.		Settled.
		J. I.	-		-		
		R. R. B.	1l, and costs		Paid.		
		R. R. B.	- ditto		Paid.		
1871	Middleton Division, held at Middleton	T. H. O.	1 -		Fine paid.		
1872		T. H. O.	- 10 -		Fine paid.		
		T. H. O.	1 -		- ditto.		
		G. H.	- 10 -		- ditto.		
		G. H.	- 1 -		- ditto.		

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of <i>England</i> and <i>Wales</i> since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.— <i>contd.</i>			Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867,"				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
LANCASTER.— <i>continued.</i> SALFORD HUNDRED.— <i>continued.</i> Middleton Division, held at Rochdale	1870	J. M.	1	Paid	Yes.	—	£. s. d.	—	—	—
		R. N.	—	Paid.		—	—	—	—	—
		D. T.	1	Paid.		—	—	—	—	—
		G. W.	1	Paid.		—	—	—	—	—
		R. F.	1	Paid.		—	—	—	—	—
	1871	J. D.	1	Paid	—	D. T.	Order made to vaccinate.	—	—	—
		J. H.	1	Paid.	—	R. F.	ditto	—	—	—
		J. T.	1	Paid.	—	G. W.	ditto	—	—	—
		T. C.	1	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		W. B.	1	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
Oldham Division, held at Royton		T. S.	1	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		W. A.	1	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1870	1 case of	20 s.	—	3 cases.	—	—	—	—	—
		10 cases of	10 s. each.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		3 cases of	5 s. each.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
LEICESTER: Loughborough Division		3 cases of	2 s. 6 d. each.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2 cases of	2 s. each.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		2 cases of	1 s. each.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1870	G. T.	— 10	No	No.	E. C.	1 11	No	No.	—
LINCOLN: Elloe Division (Parts of Holland), held at Hol- beach.	1872	J. W.	— 13 6	No	—	J. W.	1 15	No	No.	—
	1872	G. G.	1 s., and costs	No; penalty paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		G. B.	ditto	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		C. H.	ditto	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
PARTS OF KESTOVEN: Sleaford Division		R. R.	6 d., and costs	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		W. F. W.	1 s., and costs	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		W. F.	6 d., and costs	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1871	J. H.	1 s., and costs	No; fine and costs paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
1873		J. W.	20 s., and costs	ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—
		D. G.	10 s., and costs	ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—
		J. F.	20 s., and costs	Paid	—	J. F.	—	—	—	Complaint allowed to be withdrawn; no costs.
		R. W.	Would not be proceeded with if expenses paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.			Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."						
				Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.		
LINCOLN—continued.					£. s. d.				£. s. d.					
PARTS OF LINDESEY—continued.														
Market Rasen Division			1874	F. W. M. C. K. H. T. F. D. W. L.	- 9 - - 9 - 1 6 - 1 6 - 1 6 -	No No No No No	No No No No No	B. H. C. J. F.	1 6 - 1 6 -	No No	No No	-		
Wragby Division			1874	None	-	-	-	W. P. E. C.	10 - 1 -	Paid Paid.	- -	-	Child vaccinated.	
MIDDLESEX :														
METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS :														
Clerkenwell			1870	T. T. T. J. G.	1 - - -	Paid. -	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
			1871	T. J. T. J. J. S.	1 - - 1 - - 1 - -	Paid Paid. Paid.	- - -	H. H. H. H. H. H. J. R.	10 - 10 - 10 - 5 -	Paid. Paid. Paid. 7 days.	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	
			1872	J. H. J. H. J. S.	- - -	- - -	Discharged ditto. ditto.	J. S.	1 - -	Paid.	-	-	-	
			1873	G. G. W. S. R. H. R. H. E. Y.	7 6 - - - - 1 - -	Paid - - Paid. Paid.	Discharged. ditto.	E. O.	1 -	Paid.	-	-	-	
			1874	C. F. M. J. J. J. S.	1 - - - -	Paid. - -	Discharged. ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
			1870	J. H. B. L.	10 - -	Paid. -	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Greenwich (Kent)			1871	H. P. J. H. G. V. J. T. M. J. O.	To pay costs - Summons withdrawn ditto ditto 1 - -	Paid - - - Afterwards re- mitted.	Discharged. ditto. ditto.	J. H.	-	-	Discharged	-	Summons withdrawn.	
			1872	G. S. G. W. W. T. W.	1 - - Summons withdrawn ditto	Paid - -	Discharged. ditto. ditto.	G. R.	-	-	-	Discharged	-	Summons withdrawn.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

J. N.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
P.	-	- ditto -	Paid.
M. D.	-	Fined 1 s.	Not paid, defendant absconded.
	-	- ditto -	Paid.
H. R. D.	-	Fined 20 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
F. G. H.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
	-	- ditto -	Paid.
W. P.	-	Fined 1 s.	Paid.
F. W.	-	Fined 10 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
M. H. L.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
C. E. B.	-	- ditto -	Paid.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	Fined 5 s.	Paid.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	- ditto -	Paid.
	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
	-	- ditto -	Paid.
W. J. G.	-	Summons withdrawn.	
F. M.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
W. F.	-	- ditto -	Paid.
H. B.	-	Fined 5 s.	Paid.
G. Q.	-	Fined 10 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
E. A.	-	Fined 2 s. 6 d.	Paid.
W. H.	-	Summons withdrawn.	
S. K.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
P. M.	-	- ditto -	Paid.
F. T.	-	Fined 5 s.	Paid.
A. J. W.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
F. K.	-	Summons withdrawn.	
N. A.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
T. K.	-	- ditto -	Paid.
J. S.	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
S. M.	-	- ditto -	Paid.
E. P.	-	Fined 20 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	Fined 10 s.	Paid.
	-	Fined 20 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	To pay costs -	Paid.
	-	Fined 5 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	Fined 5 s.	Paid.
	-	Fined 1 s.	Paid.
	-	Fined 2 s. 6 d.	Paid.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	Fined 2 s. 6 d.	Paid.
	-	Fined 10 s.	Paid.
	-	Fined 2 s. 6 d.	Paid.
	-	Fined 5 s.	Afterwards re-mitted.
	-	- ditto -	Paid.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	
	-	- ditto -	Paid.
	-	Fined 3 s.	Paid.
	-	Summons withdrawn.	

1873 -

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867,"				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867,"			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
* MIDDLESEX— <i>continued.</i> METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS— <i>continued.</i> Greenwich (Kent)— <i>continued</i> - - -	1873 -	G. M. - A. K. W. - J. M. - C. K. - E. S. -	To pay costs - Fined 1 s. - Summons withdrawn. To pay costs - - ditto -	- Paid. - Paid. - - Paid. - Paid.	-	-	£. s. d. - - -	-	-
	1874 -	A. C. - J. G. - I. S. - E. P. - W. H. -	Fined 1 s. - - ditto. - Fined 10 s. - To pay costs - Fined 10 s. -	- Paid. - Paid. - Afterwards re- mitted. - Paid. - Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-
	1870 -	J. O. - W. K. - J. L. - A. L. - E. J. Y. - M. G. - W. A. - A. C. -	5 s. and 2 s. costs. - ditto - 2 s. costs - 5 s. and 2 s. costs. - ditto - - ditto - - ditto - 6 d. and 2 s. costs.	- Fine paid. - ditto. Costs paid. Fine paid. - ditto. - ditto. Imprisoned. Fine paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-
	1871 -	F. W. J. - F. M. - T. K. - A. P. -	2 s. costs - - ditto - - ditto - 5 s. and 2 s. costs.	- Paid. - Paid. - Paid. Imprisoned.	-	-	- - -	-	-
	1874 -	H. M. - S. S. - W. G. F. - G. N. -	20 s. and 2 s. costs. - ditto - 2 s. 6 d. and costs. 10 s. and 2 s. costs.	- - No No	Discharged; case not proved. - ditto. Paid. Paid.	-	- - -	-	-
	1874 -	- None -	-	-	-	L. J. R. -	- 10 -	No	Paid.
	1873 -	L. W. - J. C. - T. H. G. -	2 s. costs - - - - - - -	No. - -	Yes. Yes. Yes.	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	J. W. J. - G. L. -	- -	- -	Yes. Yes.	-	-	-	-
Lambeth (Surrey) - - -	1874 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marlborough-street - - -	1874 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[illegible]

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
MIDDLESEX—continued. METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS—continued. Southwark (Surrey)—continued	1872 -	A. G.	£. s. d.	-	Discharged, on paying costs.	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-
		G. W.	2 s. 6 d., and 2 s. costz.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	5 s., and 2 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. S.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. H.	3 s., and 2 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F. G.	5 s., and 2 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	J. P.	5 s., and 2 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. P.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-
	1870 -	J. L. M. M.	-	-	Withdrawn - ditto.	M. S.	1 -	Imprisoned.	-	-
	1871 -	A. D.	Postponed	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thames	1872 -	G. C.	-	-	Dismissed.	-	-	-	-	-
		G. S.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
		G. F.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
	1873 -	None	-	-	-	H. C. H. C.	1 - 1 -	- -	Paid. Paid.	-
	1874 -	None	-	-	-	T. G. O. H. E. C. H. E. C.	1 - 1 - 1 -	Yes. - -	- - -	-
	1870 -	G. H.	20 s., and 2 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1871 -	M. V.	5 s., and 4 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. W.	1 s., and 4 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. W.	1 s., and 2 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. S.	- ditto	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1872 -	B. T.	1 s., and 2 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. V.	- ditto	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*cont'd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
NORFOLK— <i>continued.</i>	1870 -	T. A.	£. s. d.	-	Yes.			£. s. d.	-	-	-
		W. J. R.	- 5 -	No.	-			-	-	-	-
	1871 -	R. R. C.	1 - -	No	-		R. R. C.	1 - -	No.	-	-
							R. R. C.	1 - -	No.	-	-
	1872 -	None	-	-	-		R. R. C.	1 - -	No.	-	-
							R. R. C.	-	-	-	Had been fined for these four children once, and Justices did not think it advisable to fine second time.
							R. R. C.	-	-	-	-
							R. R. C.	-	-	-	-
Freebridge Lynn Division	1871 -	W. J.	- 3 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-
		W. J.	- 3 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-
Freebridge Marshland Division	1873 -	E. G.	- 6 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-
		C. B.	- 1 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-
Greenhoe, North Division	1874 -	J. H.	-	-	Discharged.			-	-	-	-
								-	-	-	-
Greenhoe, South Division	1871 -	J. M.	- 6 -	-	-			-	-	-	-
		T. S.	- 6 -	-	-			-	-	-	-
		B. E.	- 6 -	-	-			-	-	-	-
		S. D.	- 6 -	-	-			-	-	-	-
Grimshoe Division	1870 -	S. C.	- 6 -	-	-			-	-	-	-
		E. L.	- 6 -	-	-			-	-	-	-
Gultercross and Shropham Division	1870 -	None.	-	-	-			-	-	-	-
								-	-	-	-
Holt Division	1870 -	None	-	-	-		A. H.	-	-	Yes	Child ordered to be vaccinated, which was afterwards done.
								-	-	-	-
	1871 -	T. L.	17, and 14s. 6d. costs.	No.	-			-	-	-	-
								-	-	-	-
	1871 -	W. H. B.	- 9 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-
								-	-	-	-
	1874 -	J. W.	- 6 3 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-
		J. R.	- 16 -	Paid.	-			-	-	-	-

[illegible]

• "Middleton Cheney" is within the Petty Sessional, Division of Brackley, and no separate minute books are kept of proceedings there.

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1876, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction*	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
NORTHAMPTON—continued. Towcester Division - - - - -	1870 -	R. F.	-	£. s. d. Fine, 5 s.	Committed, 7 days.	-	-	-	-	-	
		E. B.	-	-	-	Discharged. Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		J. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		C. K.	-	Fine, 5 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1872 -	H. H. H.	-	Conviction; no fine.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		G. W.	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		T. B.	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		C. N.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1873 -	I. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		T. H.	-	Fine, 5 s.	-	-	Discharged. ditto.	-	-	-	
		E. C.	-	-	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	
		E. S.	-	Fine, 5 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1874 -	J. R.	-	Fine, 2 s. 6 d.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		E. G.	-	Fine, 10 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Wellingborough Division - - - - -	1873 -	H. W.	-	- 2 6	No.	-	-	-	-	-	
		W. S.	-	-	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	
	1874 -	C. L.	-	-	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	
		M. P.	-	-	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	
NORTHUMBERLAND: Coquette Ward, East Division - - - - -	1874 -	W. T.	-	- 10 -	No	-	-	-	-	-	
		H. A. P.	-	1 -	No	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	W. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morpeth Ward Division - - - - -	1872 -	P. A.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. A.	-	- 2 6	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1870 -	- D.	-	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
NOTTINGHAM: Nottingham Division - - - - -	1870 -	E. T.	-	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		- S.	-	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. B.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. T.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. D.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. A. T.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. K.	-	- 1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		B. D.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. B.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874 -	A. T.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
1874 -	W. P.	-	- 6 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	

	No.	Yes	No.	Discharged.	W. A. R.	Paid.
Bingham Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Newark Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Workshop Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oxford :						
Ploughley Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rutland :						
Rutland Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
SALOP :						
Albrighton Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bradford Drayton Division, held at Market Drayton.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bradford Wem Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chirbury Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ford Division -	-	-	-	-	-	-

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

C O U N T Y AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
SALOP— <i>continued.</i> Munslow, Lower Division, and parts of Overs and Stottesden. Pinhill Division (Ellesmere District and Baschurch District).	1870 -	B. P.	£. s. d.	-	Discharged.		-	£. s. d.	-	-	-
	1870 -	J. S. R. J.	Fined costs - - ditto. -	No. No.	-		-	-	-	-	-
	1871 -	J. J.	Fined 1 s., and costs.	No.	-		-	-	-	-	-
		J. P.	- ditto -	Absconded.			-	-	-	-	-
		R. M.	- ditto -	No.			-	-	-	-	-
		L. M.	Fined costs -	No.			-	-	-	-	-
	1872 -	S. O.	Fined 2 d., and costs.	No.	-		-	-	-	-	-
		M. H.	Fined 1 s. 8 d., and costs.	No.	-		-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	R. R.	Fined costs -	No.	-		-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	S. P. W. A. R. P. T. L. G. B. J. S.	- Adjoined to enable parents to have children vaccinated; subsequently withdrawn, upon payment of costs and production of necessary certificates.	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
SOMERSET: Axbridge Division	1871 -	W. S. R. C. G.	Case dismissed 20s., and costs 7s.	- Yes, for 14 days.	-		-	-	-	-	-
	1873 -	None	-	-	-		H. P. P.	Ordered to have his child vaccinated.	-	-	-
							H. P. P.	- ditto (another child).	-	-	-
Crewkerne Division	1870 -	T. L.	2 s. 6 d., and costs 5 s. 6 d.	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
		W. M.	- ditto.	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
	1873 -	E. A. C. H.	10 s., including costs. - ditto.	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
Long Ashton Division	1873 -	H. D. H. T.	- 10 -	Yes.	-		-	-	-	-	-
					Yes; on his promise to get child vaccinated in a month, which was done.						

Shepton Mallet Division	1870 -	G. B. C. W. S. W. B. C.	5 - 5 - 5 - 5 -	Yes, promising to have child vac- cinated.	Yes No. No.	E. H. J. G. G. C.	2 6	No	No. Yes	Complaint with- drawn.
Wells Division	1871 -	J. C.	-	Yes, promising to have child vac- cinated. ditto.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
	1872 -	J. J. Y. T. H.	1 -	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	J. D. R. C. J. W.	- - To pay costs only.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
	1871 -	T. D. B. A.	2 6	Yes.	Yes.	T. K. T.	-	-	-	-
Williton Division	1871 -	-	-	-	-	B. W. J. A. J. P.	1 - 1 - 1 -	No. No. No.	- - -	- - -
	1872 -	-	-	-	-	J. P. (in respect of five chil- dren).	2 10	No.	-	-
	1873 -	-	-	-	-	B. W.	1 -	No.	-	-
	1874 -	-	-	-	-	J. P.	1 -	No.	-	-
Wiveliscombe Division	1873 -	G. S.	1 s., and 7 s. costs.	Yes, paid fine.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	W. B.	1 s., and 6 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	J. M.	1 s., and 8 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	S. A.	1 s., and 7 s. costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOUTHAMPTON:										
Alton Division	1871 -	J. P. W. W. J. B. A. L. J. A. J. R. L.	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873 -	J. H.	5 6	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1870 -	J. A. R. W. H. C. J. S. J. F.	To pay 5 s. costs To pay 5 s. costs ditto ditto	Paid. Paid. Paid. Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andover Division										
Andover Division	1870 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, AND COUNTY	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
SOUTHAMPTON—continued. Andover Division—continued	1872 -	F. P.	£. s. d. To pay 5s. fine, and 7s. 6d. costs.	Paid	-	W. K. H.	£. s. d. 10s. fine, and 8s. 9d. costs.	Paid	-	-
		C. W. D.	- ditto	Paid.	-	W. K. H.	- ditto	Paid	-	-
		J. C. B.	To pay 7s. 6d. costs.	Paid.	-					
		T. D.	-	-	-					
	1873 -	G. P.	To pay 10s. costs	Paid	-	F. P.	20s. fine, and 10s. costs.	Paid	-	-
		A. D. H.	-	-	-	F. P.	20s. fine, and 7s. 6d. costs.	Paid	-	-
		L. M.	-	-	-	F. P.	10s. fine, and 10s. costs.	Paid	-	-
			-	-	-	W. K. H.	20s. fine, and 7s. 6d. costs.	Paid	-	-
	1874 -		-	-	-	W. K. H.	- ditto	Paid	-	-
		F. P.	To pay 1l. fine, and 7s. 6d. costs.	Paid.	-					
Droxford Division	1870 -	A. K.	2s. 6d., and 7s. 6d. costs.	-	-					
		J. G.	- ditto.	-	-					
	E. R.	6d., and 7s. 6d. costs.	-	-						
	W. G.	-	-	-						
1872 -	None	-	-	-						
	None	-	-	-						
Fareham Division, held at Gosport	1871 -	J. P.	-	-	-	A. K.	Order made. 1l., and 7s. 6d. costs.	-	-	-
		H. F.	-	-	-	A. K.	Order made. 10s., and 11s. 6d. costs.	-	-	-
	W. P.	-	-	-						
	T. W.	1 -	Paid.	-	-					
1873 -	T. W.	5 -	Paid.	-						
	E. E. R.	1 -	Paid.	-						

1871 -	Southampton Division	R. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
--------	----------------------	-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
STAFFORDSHIRE—continued. West Bromwich, Wednesbury, and Walsall Division, held at Wednesbury.	1871 -	J. S.	10 s., and 2 s. costs.	—	—	—	£. s. d.	—	—	—
		J. W.	Dismissed.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		T. J.	— ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		W. C.	14 s. 6 d. costs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		J. N.	Nothing done.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		T. B.	14 s. 6 d. costs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		W. A.	— ditto	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		J. A.	Nothing done.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		E. F.	Dismissed.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1871 -	W. G.	20 s., and costs	No; paid	—	M. A.	Dismissed, case granted; magistrates' decision reversed; 20 s. fine.	—	—	—
Wolverhampton Division	1873 -	G. A. D.	Withdrawn.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		E. J.	To pay costs.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		S. B.	Withdrawn.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1872 -	A. S.	—	—	Yes.	—	—	—	—	—
Rowley Regis Division		M. H.	—	—	Yes.	—	—	—	—	—
SUFFOLK: Bungay Division	1872 -	G. D.	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1873 -	G. M.	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1872 -	R. S.	Fine 1 s., and costs 4 s. 6 d.	No	—	H. A. M.	—	—	Yes	Child found to have been vaccinated, though no certificate sent.
	1874 -	E. M.	Fine 5 s., and costs 8 s. 6 d.	No.	—	—	—	—	—	—
Woodbridge Division	1871 -	I. F.	—	—	Withdrawn	—	—	—	—	—
	1872 -	J. B.	6	No.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1873 -	G. W.	2 6	No.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	1871 -	J. E.	10	No; paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hartismere Division	1872 -	J. B.	—	—	Information dismissed.	—	—	—	—	—
	1874 -	B. B.	2 6	No; paid	—	—	—	—	—	—
		T. B.	2 6	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
		J. B.	2 6	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hoxne Division		J. B.	2 6	ditto.	—	—	—	—	—	—

[illegible]

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
SURREY— <i>continued.</i> Dorking Division— <i>continued.</i>	1870	R. J.	£. s. d.	-	Withdrawn.	-	£. s. d.	-	-
		W. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		W. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		T. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. E.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
	1871	D. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. B.	1	-	-	A. P.	1	-	-
		C. C.	5	-	-	D. M.	-	-	Withdrawn.
		T. W.	-	-	-	R. S.	-	-	ditto.
	1872	C. C.	1	-	Discharged.	J. S.	-	-	ditto.
		W. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		C. C.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Epsom Division	1871	S. B.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. E.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. H.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1870	J. B.	Costs 10 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. G.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1871	W. M.	Costs 10s.; fine 5 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. S.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guildford Division	1870	W. G. D.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1871	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Order made for each child (six) to be vaccinated within seven days. Afterwards summoned for disobedience of orders, and fined 20 s. in each case, but remitted on children being subsequently vaccinated.									
SUSSEX: Uckfield Division	1872	None	-	-	-	L. E.	-	-	No.
		J. B.	-	-	Yes, on promising to comply with the Act.	-	-	-	-
	1871	-	-	-	Yes, on promising to comply with the Act.	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	-	-	Yes, on promising to comply with the Act.	-	-	-	-
	1873	L. B.	-	-	Yes, on promising to comply with the Act.	-	-	-	-
		W. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. V.	1	-	No.	-	-	-	-
East Grinstead Division	1871	G. R.	-	-	Yes, on promising to comply with the Act.	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[illegible]

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
WARWICKSHIRE—continued.										
KNIGHTLOW HUNDRED—continued.										
Kirby Division	1874	W. R. N. F. B. E.	£. s. d. - - -	- - -	Yes. Yes. Yes.	-	-	-	-	-
Rugby Division	1872	H. W.	1 s., and 14 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. W.	- ditto.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874	H. B.	1 l., and 17 s. 6 d. costs.	Paid	-	-	1 l., and 18 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-
		H. E.	1 l., and 1 l. 1 s. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
WILTSHIRE:										
Bradford Division	1870	R. W. J. L. W. G. S.	- - -	- - -	Withdrawn. ditto. ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
	1871	T. G. J. L. J. P.	1 s., and costs ditto ditto	Levied by distress. ditto. -	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F. K.	- ditto	Levied by distress.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	J. S. J. H. J. K.	- - -	- - -	Withdrawn, on payment of costs. ditto. Yes.	-	-	-	-	-
Devizes Division	1871	J. H.	-	No.	Ordered to pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-
Hindon Division	1873	J. H.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874	J. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Salisbury and Amesbury Division	1870	E. F. N.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Swindon Division	1871	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1872	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. W. J. W. J. W. J. W.	1 1 1 1	No No No No	Yes, on payment. ditto. ditto. ditto.	-	-	-	-	-

	Discharged on pay- ment of expenses, having complied with the Act.	Discharged on pay- ment of expenses, having complied with the Act.	G. M. (three con- victions).	No. Fined, 10s., and costs, 8 s.	No.
Trowbridge Division	-	-	-	-	-
Worcestershire:					
Droitwich Division -	-	-	-	-	-
Halesowen Division -	-	-	-	-	-
Kidderminster Division -	-	-	-	-	-
Northfield Division -	-	-	-	-	-
Stourbridge Division	-	-	-	-	-
Stourport Division -	-	-	-	-	-
Upton-on-Severn Division -	-	-	-	-	-
YORKSHIRE (EAST RIDING):					
Buckrose Division -	-	-	-	-	-
1870 -	W.S. E.D. J.W. W.L.	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -
1871 -	S.L. J.P. C.T. W.N. J.P.	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -
1871 -	W.N. H.W.	- -	- -	6 6	No. No.
1872 -	G.C. J.S. T.P.	- - -	- - -	1 1 1	No. No. No.
1873 -	W.B.	-	-	To pay costs -	No
1872 -	J.P.	-	-	1 s., with costs	No.
1872 -	J.H. J.M.C. G.M.	- - -	- - -	- - 10	- - -
1873 -	G.M. I.W. G.M. (three con- victions).	- - -	- - -	1 1 10	- - -
1874 -	G.G. A.H.E. J.T.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
1872 -	S.S.	-	-	-	-
1873 -	C.D. B.F.	- -	- -	1 s. and costs - ditto	Paid. -
1874 -	J.W.	-	-	5 s., including costs.	-
1870 -	J.B. J.B.	- -	- -	- -	- -
1873 -	E.S. T.G.	- -	- -	5 10	- -
1873 -	J.T.T. J.C.	- -	- -	Fined, 5s., and costs, 8 s.	No.
1874 -	None	-	-	-	-

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.			Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
				Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
YORKSHIRE (EAST RIDING)— <i>contd.</i>					£. s. d.				£. s. d.			
Holderness, North Division	-	-	1874	J. R. L.	10s. and costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Howdenshire Division	-	-	1873	T. T.	-	-	Discharged, on a promise that his child should be vaccinated, which was done.	-	-	-	-	-
South Hunsley, Beacon Division	-	-	1871	T. E. B.	Settled on payment of costs, 4s. 6d.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				R. M.	- ditto - ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				G. L.	- ditto - ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				G. M.	Settled on payment of costs, 4s. 6d.	-	Dismissed.	-	-	-	-	-
				J. M.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				E. H. P.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				W. B.	- ditto (costs remitted).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. D. T.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. C.	- ditto (costs remitted).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				P. B.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				R. W.	- ditto (costs remitted).	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. S.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				T. H.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				G. L.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. W.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				F. B.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. H.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				G. D.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				R. T.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				C. E. B.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. G.	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				J. P.	Penalty 1s., costs, 6s. 6d.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YORKSHIRE (NORTH RIDING):												
Birdforth Division	-	-	1873	J. H.	-	No	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-
Bulmer, West Division	-	-	1872	I. M.	- 10 -	No	Yes; child vaccinated.	-	-	-	-	-
Hang, East Division	-	-	1874	R. B.	- 2 6	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
				R. B.	- 1 6	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hang, West Division	-	-	1871	W. W.	- 5 -	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
Langbaugh, East Division	-	-	1873	W. D.	1s. and costs, 7s.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-
				W. F.	1s. and costs, 10s.	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-

Year	Division	Inspector	Costs	Days	Remarks	W. H. C.	No.	W. H. C.	No.	Remarks
1872	Langthorpe, West Division	J. M.	1	No.						
1874		W. H. C.	1	No.						
1873	Malton Division	E. H.	Fine, 5 s., and costs, 5 s. 6 d.	No.						
		J. R.	Fine, 5 s., and costs, 7 s.	No.						
		J. M.	- ditto	No.						
1874		J. S.	Fine, 2 s. 6 d., and costs, 8 s. 6 d.	No.						
		T. N.	- ditto	No.						
		W. L. C.	- ditto	No.						
		T. R.	- ditto	No.						
1871	Pickering Lyth, West Division	C. L.	- 6	No.						
		R. H.		No.						
1872		R. T.		No.						
		J. G.		No.						
		G. H.		No.						
		J. G.		No.						
1874	Whitby Strand Division	W. G.	Fined, 1 s., and costs, 1 l. 10 s. 6 d.	No.						
1870	Yarm Division	J. B.		No.						
		W. S.		No.						
		W. T.		No.						
		J. S.		No.						
		J. D.		No.						
		E. N. C.		No.						
		P. P.		No.						
		J. W.		No.						
		R. H.		No.						
		W. W.		No.						
		T. M. W.		No.						
		F. W. W.		No.						
		C. S.		No.						
		J. S.		No.						
		J. M.		No.						
1873		T. W.		No.						
1870	Upper Agbrigg Division, held at Huddersfield	A. H.	1	No.						
		R. T.	1	No.						
		B. H.	1	No.						
		J. B.	1	No.						
		G. A.	1	No.						
1871		G. H.	1	No.						
1874		E. S.	10	No.						
1870	Lower Agbrigg Division	None		No.						
1872		T. C.	2	No.						
		F. A.		No.						
		J. W.		No.						
		D. B.		No.						
		J. W.		No.						

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1876, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*cont'd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867,"					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
YORKSHIRE (West Riding)—cont'd. Dewsbury Division	1870 -	I. N.	£. s. d.	-	Withdrawn	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-	
		S. I.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. S.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		H. L.	-	6	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		W. H.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		J. B.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		J. S.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		B. N.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		J. K.	-	1	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		T. W. F.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		H. A.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		A. P.	-	10	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		P. W.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		B. C.	-	10	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		J. A.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	
		A. I.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		H. A.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		W. B.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		R. H.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		G. F.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		T. H.	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-	
		W. M.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	1	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. W. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. H. P.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		W. W.	-	-	6	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		B. H.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		A. B.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. R.	-	-	10	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		T. B.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		R. N.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		W. C.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. W.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		C. S.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. F. C. A.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		J. L.	-	-	6	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	6	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. W.	-	-	6	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		W. L.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		G. H.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. G.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		L. B.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		D. M.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		G. P.	-	-	6	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. L.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		D. H.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		T. D.	-	-	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-

W. C.	6	Withdrawn.
J. H.	-	ditto.
W. A.	-	ditto.
M. S.	-	Withdrawn.
W. R. S.	-	ditto.
H. A.	6	Withdrawn.
J. H.	6	ditto.
G. M.	-	ditto.
T. T.	6	Withdrawn.
S. G.	-	Withdrawn.
R. P.	-	ditto.
J. O.	-	ditto.
T. M.	-	Withdrawn.
E. T.	6	Withdrawn.
S. G.	-	ditto.
J. K.	6	Withdrawn.
J. V.	10	Withdrawn.
V. V.	10	ditto.
J. V.	6	Withdrawn.
J. V.	-	ditto.
J. N. B.	1	Withdrawn.
T. B.	-	ditto.
W. G.	-	ditto.
T. B.	-	Withdrawn.
A. D.	6	Withdrawn.
W. L.	-	ditto.
G. T.	-	Withdrawn.
T. S.	5	Withdrawn.
W. M.	5	ditto.
T. C.	-	Warrant granted.
E. S.	-	Withdrawn.
G. W.	5	Withdrawn.
R. L.	-	ditto.
W. H.	-	ditto.
J. F.	-	Withdrawn.
J. L.	-	Withdrawn.
G. B.	-	ditto.
W. T.	5	Withdrawn.
R. B.	-	Withdrawn.
W. P.	-	Withdrawn.
T. J. P.	5	Withdrawn.
J. S.	-	Withdrawn.
B. S.	-	Withdrawn.
H. Y.	-	Withdrawn.
H. R.	-	ditto.
M. H.	-	ditto.
H. B.	-	ditto.
W. L.	5	Withdrawn.
W. S.	-	ditto.
M. C.	-	ditto.
H. S.	-	ditto.
W. B.	-	Withdrawn.
J. P.	-	ditto.
G. P.	-	ditto.
W. S.	-	ditto.
D. C.	-	ditto.
B. C.	-	ditto.
A. B.	-	ditto.
T. H.	-	ditto.
G. W.	-	ditto.
J. N. B.	-	ditto.
J. H. K.	-	ditto.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
YORKSHIRE (WEST RIDING)— <i>contd.</i> Dewsbury Division— <i>continued</i>	1871.	J. H.	£. s. d.	-	Withdrawn.	-	£. s. d.	-	-
		A. H.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		H. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		F. F.	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		G. W.	5	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		F. F.	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		M. G.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		D. W. E.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		G. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. W.	5	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		T. N.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. E. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. E.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. P.	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. G.	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. G.	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. R.	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		J. A.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		H. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		T. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. H.	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		T. E.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. J.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		M. J. H.	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		J. R.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. T.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. K.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. D. O.	1	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		W. K.	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		C. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. B.	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	6	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		B. M.	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		T. R. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. H. C.	6	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-
		J. W. H.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. O.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. S.	6	-	-	-	-	-	-

Year	Division	Name	Costs	Penalty	Days	Remarks	Discharged	Notice	Order
1873	Upper Osgodcross Division	H. B.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-
		S. C.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-
		H. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. E.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	Odley Division	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	Keighley Division, held at Keighley	R. A. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		I. E.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	Keighley Division, held at Bingley	H. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873		J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874	East Staincliffe Division	J. E.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	West Staincliffe Division, held at Settle	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1870	Upper and Lower Divisions of the Wapentake of Staincross, held at Barnsley.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1871		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

CARMARTHENSHIRE:									
Llanelli Division	1871	D. K. J. W. T. G.	- - -	- - -	No. - -	- - -	Yes. Withdrawn. Withdrawn.	- - -	- - -
	1873	J. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874	J. T. T. E. R. N. C. T. H. L. J. T. T. J. J. H. E. T.	- - - - - - - - -	1 1 6 - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	Withdrawn. ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto.	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -
Newcastle-Emlyn Division	1873	E. T.	-	*8 s. 10 d., and costs.	-	-	-	-	-
	1874	T. N.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-
CARNARVONSHIRE:									
Eifonydd Division	1871	W. J.	-	-	-	-	Discharged on pay- ment of costs.	-	-
		W. W. O. E.	- -	- -	- -	- -	- ditto.	- -	- -
	1873	W. R.	-	6 d., and 12 s. 6 d. costs.	Paid.	-	-	-	-
DENBIGHSHIRE:									
Bromfield Division	1870	J. D. S. G. W. T.	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	Settled out of court. ditto. ditto.	- - -	- - -
FLINTSHIRE:									
Mold Division	1872	W. R.	-	Costs, 6 s. 6 d.	No.	-	-	-	-
	1871	D. J. J. M. M. J.	- - -	1 s., and costs Costs, 6 s. 6 d.	No. No.	- -	- -	- -	- -
	1872	J. B. T. H. R. M.	- - -	6 s. 6 d. costs - 1 s., and 6 s. 6 d. costs.	No. No.	- -	Yes. -	5 s., and 7 s. 6 d. costs.	No.
	1873	S. R.	-	Costs, 6 s. 6 d.	No.	-	-	-	-
	1874	J. J. S. J.	- -	Costs, 6 s. 2 s. 6 d., and 7 s. 6 d. costs.	No. No.	- -	- -	- -	- -
Northop Division	1873	R. G.	-	5 s., and costs	No.	-	-	-	-
Rhuddlan Division	1873	E. P.	-	-	-	-	-	Costs, 2 s. 6 d.	-
	1874	None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1873	J. B.	-	1 s., and costs	-	-	-	-	-
Flint (Borough) Division									
GLAMORGANSHIRE:									
Caerphilly, Higher Division	1871	D. P. J. C. J. L. H. W. S.	- - - -	1 - 6 10	Yes. No. No. No.	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -	- - - -

* For neglecting to cause child to be inspected after vaccination.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

COUNTY AND NAME OF PETTY SESSIONS, &c.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
GLAMORGANSHIRE—continued. Caerphilly, Higher Division—continued	1872 -	D. L.	£. s. d. 1 - -	No.	-	-	£. s. d. - - -	-	-	-	
		D. W. E.	1 - 6	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		S. T.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		J. D.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		D. L.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		T. C.	- - -	-	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		J. J.	- - -	-	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
	1874 -	R. O.	5 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		G. I.	- - -	-	No.*	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		A. H.	6 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
Kibbor, Hundred Division	1870 -	E. S.	1 - 3	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. H.	- - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. J.	3 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. J.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
Miskin, Higher Division	1870 -	E. W.	10 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		D. S.	10 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		R. T.	10 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
	1871 -	J. C.	10 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
1872 -		R. H.	2 - 6	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. W.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. D.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		D. J.	- - -	-	Yes.	-	- - -	-	-	-	
1873 -		I. H.	- - -	-	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. M.	2 - 6	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		L. G.	5 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
	1874 -	J. G. C.	10 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
1874 -		D. D.	1 - -	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		D. J.	3 - 3	No.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		D. J.	- - -	-	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		J. G.	1 - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
1872 -			6d. and 8s. 6d. costs.	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
1873 -		E. D.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		R. E.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. J.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. M.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		J. W.	6d. and 8s. 6d. costs.	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. D.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
Swansea, Hundred Division		W. W.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		R. J.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. D.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		R. E.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. J.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. M.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
MERIONETHSHIRE: Ardudwywchartro Division		J. W.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. D.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		W. W.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		R. J.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		E. D.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	
		R. E.	- - -	Paid.	-	-	- - -	-	-	-	

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

BOROUGH PETTY SESSIONS.

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
ENGLAND AND WALES:	1874 -	E. J.	1 s. and costs	Fine paid.	—	—	£. s. d.	—	—
		E. J.	- ditto	- ditto.					
		H. G.	- ditto.	- ditto.					
		W. J.	1 s. including costs.	- ditto.					
		E. M.	- ditto	- ditto.					
	1870 -	W. E.	- ditto	- ditto.	Dismissed. Yes.	—	—	—	—
		J. F. W.	-	No; paid					
		W. G.	9 6	-					
		C. D.	-	-					
		H. D'A.	-	-					
Abington	1871 -	D. F.	-	-	Withdrawn. ditto. ditto. Dismissed. Withdrawn. ditto. ditto. ditto. Yes. Dismissed.	—	—	—	—
		S. V. L.	-	-					
		J. W.	-	-					
		F. M.	-	-					
		J. C.	-	-					
	1870 -	W. H.	-	-					
		P. V.	-	-					
		R. H.	-	-					
		T. J. B.	5 -	No; paid					
		J. S.	-	-					
Ashton-under-Lyne	1870 -	W. C.	2 6	No	No.	—	—	—	—
		G. M.	2 6	No					
	1872 -	J. B.	5 -	No	No.	—	—	—	—
		J. B.	1 -	No					
Banbury	1871 -	None	-	-	-	J. H. J. W.	Fined 10 s. - ditto	Paid. Yes	Yes
		None	-	-					
	1872 -	None	-	-	-	S. C. J. A. T. D. M. F. T. J. S.	Fined 10 s. - ditto	Paid. -	Qr.
		None	-	-					
Barnstaple	1872 -	G. B.	10 s. and costs, 15 s. 6 d.	No.	-	—	—	—	—

Fines and costs paid during imprisonment.

Bath, City and Borough	1872	R. C. R. C. R. P.	- - -	- - -	- - -	6 d., and 6 d. costs.	No.	- - -	Yes. Yes.
		C. M.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		C. A.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		T. J.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		C. H.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
1873		T. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		T. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		S. A.	-	-	-	2 s., and 6 d. costs.	No.	-	
		A. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		A. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
1874		C. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		R. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		J. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		G. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		M. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		J. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		G. A.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		W. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		E. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		G. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		I. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		J. C.	-	-	-	2 s. 6 d., and 2 s. 6 d. costs.	-	-	Yes.
		G. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		S. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		H. G.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Yes.
		J. A.	-	-	-	10 s. 6 d., and costs.	-	-	Yes.
Beverley	1872	C. H.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
	1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bideford	1871	J. B.	-	-	-	5 s. 6 d., inclu- ding expenses.	No	-	Paid.
	1872	S. D.	-	-	-	5 s. 6 d., inclu- ding expenses.	No	-	Paid.
		W. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	Discharged.
Birmingham	1870	J. C.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		J. J.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		G. H.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		F. W. W.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		W. H.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	
		T. H.	-	-	-	-	Yes; one calen- dar month.	-	
		W. D. H.	-	-	-	-	No.	-	Discharged.
		P. G.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
		H. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
		H. J. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
		C. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
		J. A.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
		S. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.
		J. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	ditto.

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
Birmingham—continued	1871	A. H.	£. s. d.	No.				£. s. d.			
		B. R.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		J. R.	5 - -	No.				- - -			
		G. B.	5 - 6	No.				- - -			
		T. C.	2 5 -	No.				- - -			
		J. B.	5 - -	No.				- - -			
		C. H.	2 6 -	No.				- - -			
		E. C.	2 6 -	No.				- - -			
		A. D.	5 - -	No.				- - -			
		T. S.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		G. C.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		W. C.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		W. M.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		J. C.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		A. B.	- - -					- - -			
		E. V.	- - -					- - -			
		J. H.	- - -					- - -			
		R. R.	- - -					- - -			
		G. F.	- - -					- - -			
		A. D.	- - -					- - -			
	1872	F. B.	- - -					- - -			
		G. C.	- - -					- - -			
		R. O.	- - -					- - -			
		C. C.	- - -					- - -			
		A. W.	- - -					- - -			
		S. W.	- - -					- - -			
		W. W.	- - -					- - -			
		G. N.	- - -					- - -			
		T. B.	- - -					- - -			
		G. W.	5 - -	No.				- - -			
		H. O.	5 - 6	No.				- - -			
		J. A. S.	2 2 6	No.				- - -			
		J. L.	2 6 -	No.				- - -			
		J. W. F.	5 - -	No.				- - -			
		W. B.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		A. H.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		C. K.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		H. W.	1 - -	No.				- - -			
		L. B.	- - -					- - -			
		J. V.	- - -					- - -			
J. C. G.	- - -					- - -					
A. S.	- - -					- - -					
F. J. P.	- - -					- - -					
W. R.	- - -					- - -					
J. T.	- - -					- - -					
W. M.	- - -					- - -					
H. F.	- - -					- - -					

[illegible]

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.		Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
			Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
Brecon	- - - - -	1872 -	J. B. W. E.	£. s. d. 1 s., and costs, - ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bridgnorth	- - - - -	1871 -	R. B.	Fined 6 d., and 6 s. costs.	In default seven days' hard labour.	-	-	-	-	-	
Bridgwater	- - - - -	1871 -	G. W.	-	-	The child having been vaccinated before return of summons, no evidence offered.	E. J. B. - W. H. R. - E. J. B. - W. H. R. - W. H. R. -	20 s., and costs, - ditto. - ditto. 5 s., and costs, - ditto.	-	-	
			A. P. E. T. S. S.	- - -	- - -	- ditto. Discharged on pay- ment of costs, defendant pro- mising to have his child vaccin- ated.	-	-	-	-	
		1872 -	W. B.	-	-	- ditto.	W. H. R. - W. H. R. -	20 s., and costs, - ditto.	-	-	
		1873 -	None	-	-	-	W. H. R. - W. H. R.	20 s., and costs, - ditto.	-	-	
Bridport	- - - - -	1870 -	J. J. P. B. R. J. B. P. S. E. H. G. C. T. F. W. W. G. S. E. R. E. A.	- - 1 - 1 - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - - - -	Yes. Yes.	-	-	-	-	
		1871 -	D. H. J. A. E. S.	- 2 8 2 6	- - -	Yes	N. P. - T. B. C. -	- 5 -	-	Yes	Complied order.
Brighton	- - - - -	1871 -	2 persons	Withdrawn on payment of costs after certificate pro- duced.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		1873 -	11 persons	-	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.		Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
			Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
Bristol—continued	-	1874 -	S. V.	£. s. d.	-	Discharged.	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-	
			M. W.	-	-	To pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-	
			E. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
			J. S. R.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
			S. E.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	
			S. G.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
			A. G.	-	-	To pay costs.	-	-	-	-	-	
Buckingham	-	1870 -	W. P.	2s. 6 d., and costs.	-	Not enforced.	-	-	-	-		
			J. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bury St. Edmunds	-	1871 -	W. S.	17s., including costs.	No.	-	-	-	-	-		
			G. R.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Cambridge	-	1872	A. F.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-		
			None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
			None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
			None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Cardiff	-	1873 -	32 persons	-	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-		
			30 persons; 1 convicted, T. P.	10 -	No	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
Carmarthen	-	1872 -	M. M.	5 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-		
			C. J.	6 -	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Chesterfield *	-	1872 -	None	-	-	-	G. M. G.	10 -	No.	-	-	
			None	-	-	-	J. G. G.	5 -	No.	-	-	
			None	-	-	-	G. M. G.	5 -	No.	-	-	
			None	-	-	-	J. G.	5 -	No.	-	-	
	-	1874 -	None	-	-	-	G. M. G.	6 -	No.	-	-	
			None	-	-	-	G. M. G.	1 -	No.	-	-	

[illegible]

* In the following cases the persons were summoned under sec. 31 of the Act, and orders were made for children to be vaccinated, but no convictions were had. —

1870	-	-	J. M.	-	(Costs to be paid by defendant).
				1874	- G. M. G. (Costs to be paid by defendant).

1870 - - J. M. - (Costs to be paid by defendant).

1872 - - G. M. G. - - ditto - - ditto.

1873	-	-	G. M. G.	-	-	ditto	-	-	ditto.
------	---	---	----------	---	---	-------	---	---	--------

J. G.	-	-	ditto	-	ditto.
J. G.	-	-	ditto	-	ditto.

1874 - - G. M. G. (Costs to be paid by defendant).

G. M. G. - - ditto - - ditto.

J. G. - - - ditto - - ditto.

P. B.	-	-	ditto.
G. M. G.	.	.	ditto.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
Dewsbury	1870 -	J. G.	£. s. d.	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-
		J. P.	- 6	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		M. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. J.	- 6	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
		W. T.	- 6	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. Q.	- 6	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. A.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		R. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	- 6	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		W. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M. S.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		B. E.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
	1871 -	B. E.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		P. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. A.	- 10	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
		G. I.	- 6	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		F. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-
		W. E. B.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-
	D. M.	- 1	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	T. V.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	D. H.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	W. H.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	J. A.	- 6	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	J. W.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	R. F.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	E. O.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	P. H.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	J. G.	- 1	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	J. H.	-	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	M. C.	- 6	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	G. R.	- 6	-	-	Withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	
	E. W. M.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	F. G.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	B. G.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
M. F.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
G. R.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
J. S.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
H. F.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
M. T.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
W. H. S.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
F. S.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
E. W. P.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
E. F.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
J. R.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		

J. R.	ditto.	-
B. P.	ditto.	-
J. N.	ditto.	-
S. C.	ditto.	-
H. S.	ditto.	-
H. M.	ditto.	-
E. S.	ditto.	-
M. K.	ditto.	-
B. B.	ditto.	-
J. W.	ditto.	-
J. A.	ditto.	-
J. W.	ditto.	-
J. M.	ditto.	-
B. E.	ditto.	-
H. S.	ditto.	-
B. S.	ditto.	-
C. H.	ditto.	-
G. O.	ditto.	-
A. G.	ditto.	-
M. G.	ditto.	-
L. L.	ditto.	-
G. P.	ditto.	-
W. C.	ditto.	-
S.	ditto.	-
J. R.	ditto.	-
J. G.	ditto.	-
J. G.	ditto.	-
H. S.	ditto.	-
S. C.	ditto.	-
J. L.	ditto.	-
J. G.	ditto.	-
S. C.	ditto.	-
T. B.	ditto.	-
T. W.	ditto.	-
J. H.	ditto.	-
J. S.	ditto.	-
S. S.	ditto.	-
J. H.	ditto.	-
W.	ditto.	-
A. C.	ditto.	-
F. T.	ditto.	-
J. W.	ditto.	-
W.	ditto.	-
T. P.	ditto.	-
G. O.	ditto.	-
E. R.	ditto.	-
E. S.	ditto.	-
A. B.	ditto.	-
J. L.	ditto.	-
S. H.	ditto.	-
M. I.	ditto.	-
T. T.	ditto.	-
H. L.	ditto.	-
T. G.	ditto.	-
L. S.	ditto.	-
H. S.	ditto.	-
J. H.	ditto.	-
S. H.	ditto.	-
W. M.	ditto.	-
S. G.	ditto.	-
I. O.	ditto.	-
W. M.	ditto.	-
M. A. P.	ditto.	-
T. B.	ditto.	-
A. F.	ditto.	-

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
Dewsbury—continued	1871 -	T. M.	£. s. d.	-	Withdrawn.	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-	
		J. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		B. R.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. L.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		T. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		G. R.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. H.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		F. N.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. R.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		G. P.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		E. L.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		R. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. R.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		T. G.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
		A. R.	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		M. D.	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		P. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
J. P.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-			
J. W. S.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-			
J. S.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-			
J. S.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-			
W. H. H.	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-			
1872 -	J. H.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	T. B. B.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	W. R. R.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	W. T.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	W. T.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
1873 -	W. H.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	W. M. M.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
W. H. H.	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	W. T. D.	10s., and costs, 10s. 6d.	No; paid.	-	-	-	-	-	-		
1871 -	T. B.	ditto	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
	W. M.	8s., costs	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-		
1871 -	J. C. M.	-	-	-	Withdrawn (discharged).	-	-	-	-		
	J. P.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
	J. D.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
	A. P.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
	J. M.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
	J. T. A.	-	-	-	Withdrawn on payment of costs.	-	-	-	-		
	W. M. C.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-		
T. M.	-	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-			

	E. W. F. J.	-	-	1 s., and costs	No; paid.	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	J. W.	-	-	2 s. 6 d., and costs	No; paid.	
	I. B.	-	-	5 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	T. G.	-	-	1 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	J. T.	-	-	1 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	M. H. R.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn.
	W. P.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	J. B.	-	-	1 s., and costs	No; paid.	
	J. G.	-	-	1 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	E. D.	-	-	5 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	W. F.	-	-	1 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	B. S.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	W. G.	-	-	1 s., and costs	No; paid.	
	T. W.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	H. H.	-	-	1 s., and costs	No; paid.	
	M. A. R.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	S. G.	-	-	-	-	Discharged.
	H. B.	-	-	1 s., and costs	No; paid.	
	T. S.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	J. S.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.
	T. W.	-	-	5 s., and costs	Yes; for 14 days.	
	J. D.	-	-	5 s., and costs	No; paid.	
1872 -	W. T.	-	-	5 s., and costs	No; paid.	
	W. V.	-	-	3 s. 6 d., and costs	- ditto.	
	M. F.	-	-	1 s., and costs	- ditto.	
	I. B.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	F. H.	-	-	-	-	- ditto.
	J. C.	-	-	5 s., and costs	No; paid.	
	T. F.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	G. W.	-	-	5 s., and costs	No; paid.	
1873 -	J. A. H.	-	-	-	-	Withdrawn on pay- ment of costs.
	E. H.	-	-	5 s., and costs	No; paid.	
1870 -	C. K.	-	-	6	--	
	E. D.	-	-	6	-	
	W. J. G.	-	-	1	-	
	G. M. S.	-	-	6	-	
	N. B.	-	-	5	-	
1871 -	J. F.	-	-	5	-	
	A. G.	-	-	1	-	
	C. H.	-	-	1	-	
	T. L. B.	-	-	1	-	
	J. M.	-	-	1	-	
	D. E.	-	-	1	-	
	A. H.	-	-	1	-	

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
Faversham	1870 -	C. D.	£. s. d. Costs, 7 s. 6 d.	-	-	-	£. s. d. -	-	-
		T. G.	- ditto	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. H.	- Fine, 1 s.; costs, 13 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Flint	1873 -	J. B.	1 s. and costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gateshead	1870 -	R. A. L.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. L.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C. D.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. B. G.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
1871 -	1871 -	J. C.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		P. L.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
1872 -	1872 -	J. K.	5 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		M. G.	2 6	No.	-	-	-	-	-
Glossop	1870 -	J. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. R.	5 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. P. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		D. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. F.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	1 -	No.	-	-	-	-	-
1874 -	1874 -	None	-	-	-	J. M.	- 10 -	No.	-
		W. H. C.	5 s. and costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gloucester, City	1872 -	J. G.	1 s. and costs	Imprisoned.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. L.	5 s. and costs	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-
		H. C. B.	- ditto	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	1 s. and costs	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-
		G. J. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. W.	5 s. and costs	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-
		R. G.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873 -	1873 -	T. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		B. G.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874 -	1874 -	F. L.	5 s. and costs	Paid.	-	-	-	-	-

Year	Place	Name	Age	Sex	Religion	Occupation	Married	Children	Notes	Remarks
1870	Grantham	J. G.	10	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
1874	Grimsby	T. S.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
1871	Guildford	W. H. E.	5	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		J. B.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		J. B.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		H. C. W.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		J. K.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		W. H.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		The proceedings under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," in this district are taken in the stipendiary's police courts.								
1871	Hartlepool	F. T. M. (two children.)	2	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	2		
1871	Hastings	J. L.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		G. D.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		W. C. B.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		M. H., sen.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		T. C.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		J. S.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		W. R. C.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		G. H. B.	10	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	10		
		G. T. R.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		J. F.	10	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	10		
		J. M.	5	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	5		
		A. M., jun.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		G. W. W.	5	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	5		
1872		G. G.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
1873		J. T.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		J. J.	10	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	10		
1872	Hereford, City	T. B.	2	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	2		
		W. D.	6	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	6		
		T. J.	2	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	2		
		J. P.	6	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	6		
		W. B.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
1873		J. B.	5	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	5		
1873	Hertford	J. A.	1	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	1		
		M. A. N.	2	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	2		
1874		R. W. C.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		R. C.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		J. W.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		E. J. B.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		J. L.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		C. R. W.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		
		W. P.	-	M	Anglican	Labourer	Yes	-		

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
Huddersfield - - - - -	1873 -	L. S.	£. s. d. - 2 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		L. S.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	A. H.	- 5 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		M. G.	- 10 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ipswich - - - - -	1870 -	J. T.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		E. R.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. M.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	- 10 -	No.	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		B. B.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. F.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. W. S.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-
		T. C.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-
1871 -		M. A. B.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.	-	-	-	-	-
1872 -		C. A.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	M. A. B.	- 10 6	No.	No.	No.
1873 -		None	-	-	-	-	M. A. B.	- 10 6	No.	No.	No.
1874 -		W. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		C. M.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		H. B.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		S. B. S.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		G. F.	- 1 6	No.	No.	No.	W. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		J. N.	- 2 6	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		H. R. H.	- 5 -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		R. B.	- 1 -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		C. C.	- 1 -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		W. W. H.	- 1 -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		T. E.	- 1 -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		W. C.	- 1 -	No.	No.	No.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		A. C. T.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		R. T.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		G. H. K.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		J. L. R.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		W. B.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		A. T.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		T. R.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		C. S. A.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.
		C. E.	-	-	Yes.	Yes.	J. R.	1 - -	No.	No.	No.

[illegible]

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
Kingslton-upon-Hull— <i>continued</i>	1873 -	C. C.	£. s. d.	-	-	-	£. s. d.	-	-
		A. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. O.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		B. Y.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. N.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1874 -	M. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. G. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. D.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. G. H. L.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		A. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. G.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. I.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. J.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. E.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. B.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		H. T. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[illegible]

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of <i>England</i> and <i>Wales</i> since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.— <i>contd.</i>				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."		Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."		Whether Discharged.		Whether Discharged.		Grounds of Discharge.	
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
Leeds— <i>continued</i>	1874 -	-	£. s. d.	-	-	A. A.	£. s. d.	-	-	Order made, ditto.	-
		-	-	-	-	J. A.	-	-	-	Fine paid.	-
		-	-	-	-	G. A.	1 - -	No	-	ditto.	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	10 - -	No	-	ditto.	-
		-	-	-	-	J. P.	10 - -	No	-	ditto.	-
Leominster	1873 -	-	-	-	-	A. A.	1 - -	No	-	Order made, ditto.	-
		-	-	-	-	J. R. W.	-	-	-	Fine paid.	-
		-	-	-	-	H. W.	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	J. S.	10 - -	No	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lincoln, City	1872 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Liverpool	1873 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ladlow	1872 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Macclesfield	1872 -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Ordered to have child vaccinated within 14 days; order obeyed.
Child vaccinated since summons taken out; ordered to pay 4s. costs.

Case withdrawn on production of medical certificate that child was unfit.

Manchester, City

400.

K 4

Year	Name	Age	Sex	Status	Paid	Discharged	Summons withdrawn	Order to vaccinate in three weeks	Order to vaccinate in six weeks	In consequence of defendant's neglecting to produce children for which no penalty attached	In consequence of defendant having left the country
1870	J. C.	-	-	-	1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. R.	-	-	-	Ordered to pay cost of summons.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	I. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1871	E. H.	-	-	-	1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. T.	-	-	-	1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	T. P.	-	-	-	Ordered to pay cost of summons.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. S.	-	-	-	Ordered to pay cost of summons.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. T.	-	-	-	Withdrawn; child vaccinated.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	J. B.	-	-	-	Summons withdrawn.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	J. D.	-	-	-	- ditto - ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P. T.	-	-	-	- 1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. L.	-	-	-	- 1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	A. D.	-	-	-	Summons withdrawn	-	-	-	-	-	-
	P. B.	-	-	-	No appearance of complainant or defendant.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. T. W.	-	-	-	- 1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	J. P.	-	-	-	- 1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874	J. E. H.	-	-	-	1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	J. N. S.	-	-	-	- 10 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. P.	-	-	-	- 2 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
1870	W. H. R.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	H. B.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. H.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. H. H.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	A. H.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	J. P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1871	W. H.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	E. P.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	R. T.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	B. G.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. M.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1874	J. B.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	E. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1871	G. N.	-	-	-	1 7 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	M. S.	-	-	-	- 5 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	C. H.	-	-	-	6 s. costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W. S.	-	-	-	11 s. costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
1872	R. S.	-	-	-	- 10 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
1873	G. N.	-	-	-	1 2 6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	G. N.	-	-	-	1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-
	R. S.	-	-	-	1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-

Middlesbrough

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
Morpeth	1872	M. B.	£. s. d. 6 d., and costs 12 s. 6 d.	Yes, seven days.	—	—	£. s. d. —	—	—	—	
	1870	J. B.	1 —	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. B.	1 —	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. M.	1 —	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		W. A.	2 6	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	1871	J. B. H.	5 —	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. F.	1 —	Paid.	—	J. B.	1 —	Paid.	—	—	
		R. G.	1 —	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		G. B.	1 —	Paid.	Dismissed.	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. C.	1 —	Paid.	Dismissed.	—	—	—	—	—	
Newport (Monmouth)	1874	W. J. W.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. G.	1 —	Paid.	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		M. H.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		In the year 1873, four persons were summoned.					—	—	—	—	
		In the year 1874, five persons were summoned. (But the persons agreeing to obey the Act, the cases were discharged, and there have been no convictions).					—	—	—	—	
Northampton	1870	J. E.	10 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	No.	—	—	—	—	—	
		B. S.	—	No	No.	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. T.	—	No	No.	—	—	—	—	—	
		R. D.	—	No	No.	Discharged on payment of costs.	—	—	—	—	
		G. M. T.	—	—	—	Discharged.	—	—	—	—	
		E. G.	—	—	—	ditto.	—	—	—	—	
		W. H. B.	—	—	—	ditto.	—	—	—	—	
		F. T.	—	—	—	ditto.	—	—	—	—	
		I. B.	—	—	—	ditto.	—	—	—	—	
		H. N. C.	—	—	—	ditto.	—	—	—	—	
		A. G. H.	10 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	No.	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. M. Q.	—	No	No.	Discharged on payment of costs.	—	—	—	—	
		J. D.	—	No	No.	Discharged.	—	—	—	—	
C. H.	—	No	No.	ditto.	—	—	—	—			
J. W.	—	No	No.	ditto.	—	—	—	—			
		C. J. H.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. M.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		E. N.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		J. L.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
		R. C. A.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

			No.	No.	
W. G.	10s., and costs	No.	No.		
J. L.	7s. 6d.	-	-		
A. T.	ditto	-	No.	No.	
C. H.	ditto	-	No.	No.	
A. P.	ditto	-	Yes, 14 days	No.	
C. W.	-	-	No.	Discharged.	
H. H.	-	-	-	ditto.	
C. C.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
C. M.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. L.	-	-	-	ditto.	
A. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
C. M.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. M.	-	-	-	ditto.	
T. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
R. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
R. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. J. L.	10s., and costs	No.	No.		
	7s. 6d.	-	-		
W. B.	2s. 6d., and costs	No.	No.		
	7s. 6d.	-	-		
J. J. E.	ditto	No.	No.		
T. R.	ditto	No.	No.		
C. J. M.	ditto	Yes; 7 days	No.		
J. T.	ditto	No.	No.		
C. S.	ditto	No.	No.		
T. O. C.	ditto	No.	No.		
W. W.	ditto	No.	No.		
G. K.	ditto	No.	No.		
J. B.	ditto	No.	No.		
J. C.	-	-	-	Discharged on pay- ment of costs.	
T. G.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. R.	-	-	-	Discharged.	
N. C.	-	-	-	ditto.	
F. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. W.	-	-	-	ditto.	
E. C.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. D.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. R.	-	-	-	ditto.	
F. G.	-	-	-	ditto.	
C. T.	-	-	-	ditto.	
G. D.	-	-	-	ditto.	
G. H.	-	-	-	ditto.	
G. S.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. P.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. D.	-	-	-	ditto.	
A. V.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. L.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. C.	-	-	-	ditto.	
W. B.	-	-	-	ditto.	
J. J.	-	-	-	Discharged on pay- ment of costs.	
J. M.	-	-	-	Discharged.	
J. D.	-	-	-	ditto.	
	-	-	-	ditto.	

1871 -

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
Northampton— <i>continued</i>	1871 -	T. W.	£. s. d.	-	Discharged.	-	-	£. s. d.	-	-	-
		D. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. D.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. E.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. M.	2 s. 6 d., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. B.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. T.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. L.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. N.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		S. G. T.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		T. M.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		C. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		F. N.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1872 -	G. M. T.	10 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. G.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. B.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. J.	10 s., and costs 6 s. 6 d.	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. E. W.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. H.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. E.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. S.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		B. P.	10 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. J. C.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	10 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M.	-	-	No.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	Discharged on payment of costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. B.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. G.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. P.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. S.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. G.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. H.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		G. W.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-

G. C.	ditto.
I. P.	ditto.
W. L.	ditto.
H. P.	ditto.
T. B.	ditto.
T. B.	ditto.
D. F.	ditto.
J. B.	ditto.
J. H. C.	Discharged on pay- ment of costs.
T. C.	ditto.
W. B. C.	Discharged.
J. D.	ditto.
G. D.	ditto.
J. E.	ditto.
J. E.	ditto.
J. E.	Discharged on pay- ment of costs.
J. E.	Discharged.
J. H. G.	ditto.
J. G.	ditto.
W. H.	ditto.
T. H.	ditto.
E. H.	ditto.
J. H.	ditto.
J. J.	ditto.
W. K.	ditto.
J. K.	ditto.
E. F.	ditto.
C. M.	ditto.
W. M.	ditto.
J. P. M.	ditto.
J. P.	ditto.
J. P.	ditto.
F. S.	ditto.
W. S.	ditto.
S. F. S.	ditto.
J. S.	ditto.
R. T.	ditto.
T. W.	ditto.
A. W.	ditto.
S. M.	ditto.
F. G.	ditto.
F. T.	ditto.
C. T.	ditto.
G. S.	ditto.
W. S.	ditto.
T. S.	ditto.
I. S.	ditto.
E. R.	ditto.
T. P.	ditto.
T. O.	ditto.
J. M.	ditto.
J. M.	ditto.
J. L.	ditto.
D. T. L.	ditto.
G. L.	ditto.
J. J.	ditto.
T. D.	ditto.
J. D.	ditto.
W. D.	Discharged on pay- ment of costs.
S. C.	Discharged.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
Northampton— <i>continued</i>	1872 -	J. H. C.	£. s. d.	-	Discharged.	-	£. s. d.	-	-
		W. C.	-	-	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		T. C. B.	-	-	Discharged on payment of costs.	-	-	-	-
		A. B.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. B.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		I. A.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. A.	-	-	Discharged.	-	-	-	-
		J. B.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		W. T.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. T.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		C. S.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. S.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		G. W. R.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		B. R.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		W. M.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. K.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. J.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		R. G.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		G. G.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		F. W. A.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. G.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		C. F.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		A. C.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		D. H.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. B.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		H. W.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		S. W.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. W.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		H. N. W.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		T. E. W.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		M. W.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. H.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		G. G.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		H. S.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		E. D.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-
		F. D.	-	-	Discharged on payment of costs.	-	-	-	-
		F. K.	2 s. 6 d., and costs 6 s.	No	No	G. M. T.	-	-	Ordered to have child vaccinated in 14 days and pay costs.
		L. R.	-	-	Discharged.	J. R.	-	-	- ditto.
		W. S.	-	-	- ditto.	W. E. W.	-	-	- ditto.
		J. S.	-	-	- ditto.	J. C.	-	-	- ditto.
		J. T. E.	-	-	- ditto.	E. O.	-	-	- ditto.
		I. S.	-	-	- ditto.	J. C.	-	-	- ditto.
		C. B.	-	-	- ditto.	E. F.	-	-	- ditto.
		O. N.	-	-	- ditto.	T. O. C.	-	-	- ditto.
		J. G.	-	-	- ditto.	-	-	-	-

Year	Name	Age	Costs	Discharged	Remarks
1874	C. T.	-	-	-	Discharged -
	H. R.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	H. B.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	W. O.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	J. P.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	G. W.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	J. B. L.	-	1 s., and costs 6 s.	No	-
	W. W.	-	5 s., and costs 6 s.	No	-
	T. P.	-	5 s., and costs 6 s.	No	-
	G. C.	-	- ditto 6 s. 6 d.	No	-
	T. L. N.	-	5 s., and costs 6 s.	No	-
	J. M.	-	-	-	Discharged.
	J. R.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	G. R. H.	-	-	-	- ditto.
	A. D. H.	-	5 s., and costs 6 s.	No	-
	M. O. C.	-	1 l., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	-
	G. S.	-	5 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	-
	G. H.	-	1 l., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	-
	B. P.	-	- ditto 10 s., and costs 7 s. 6 d.	No	-
	A. R.	-	-	-	-
1871	R. E.	-	1 7	-	Discharged on payment.
	T. P.	-	- 19	-	Yes; 14 days.
	G. C.	-	2 9	-	Discharged on payment.
	G. N.	-	- 12 6	-	Yes; 7 days.
	J. R.	-	1 11	-	Left the City before conviction was enforced, viz., 21 days' imprisonment in default of payment.

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England and Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."					Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.	
Nottingham	1871 -	W. L.	£. s. d. - 10 -	-	-	-	£. s. d. -	-	-	-	
	1873 -	R. W. J. L.	- 10 - 1 - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1871 -	J. F. E. M. J. C. P. J. H. A. M.	- 4 - - 4 - - 4 - - 10 6 - 10 6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	1874 -	B. P. W. H. W.	- 4 - - 4 -	-	Yes. Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	C. H. E. C. G. S. A. C. W. W. G. G. G. D. J. C.	1 s. and costs - ditto - ditto - ditto - ditto - ditto - ditto -	No. No. No. No. No. No. No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
1871 -	J. W. L. R. W. C. J. B. J. O. J. S. W. H. T. B.	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	Dismissed. ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto. ditto. -	-	-	-	-	-		
	1872 -	J. S. J. H. W. H. R. H.	- - - -	- - - -	Dismissed. ditto. ditto. ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	
	1870 -	G. W. G. B. E. W. D. P. E. E. D. J. T. M. J. H. I. J. W. W. W. K. C. R. P. G. R. T. E. C.	- 10 - 1 - - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - - 15 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - - 10 - 1 - -	No. No. Yes. No. No. No. No. No. No. Yes. Yes. No.	-	-	-	-	-	-	

1871	J. B. H.	-	-	-	15	No.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
------	----------	---	---	---	----	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*cont'd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Grounds of Discharge.
Scarborough.	1870.	G. C.	£. s. d. - 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		G. H.	- 2 6	Yes.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. J. R.	- 10 -	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		W. W.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. W.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. K.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		J. M.	- 1 -	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		H. A.	- 1 -	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		A. J. T.	- 5 -	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
		P. W.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-
1871.	P. L.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	
	C. H.	- 2 6	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	
	A. J. T.	- 1 -	No	No.	-	-	-	-	-	
1874.	J. T.	- - -	-	Yes; produced a certificate of vaccination.	-	-	-	-	-	
Sheffield	1870.	G. H.	- 1 -	Paid.	Withdrawn -	-	G. F.	- 2 6	-	Withdrawn.
		A. W.	- - -	-	-	-	B. D.	- 1 -	Paid.	-
		J. G.	- - -	-	Discharged.	-	H. B.	- 5 -	Paid.	-
		H. W.	- - -	-	- ditto.	-	J. C.	- 1 -	Paid.	-
		G. L.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-	W. F.	- - -	-	To pay costs.
		G. W.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-	J. A.	- - -	-	-
		H. L.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-				
		T. N.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-				
		S. S.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-				
		T. C.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-				
1871.	J. G.	- 1 -	Paid.	Withdrawn.	-					
	J. J. H.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
	J. H.	- - -	-	Withdrawn.	-					
	J. E. L.	- - -	Neither parties appeared.	-	-					
	A. G.	- 5 -	Paid.	Withdrawn.	-					
	W. D.	- 5 -	Paid.	-	-					
	R. W. H.	- 5 -	Paid.	-	-					
	G. H. C.	- 5 -	Paid.	-	-					
	W. C.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
	P. C.	- - -	Paid.	-	-					
1871.	J. F.	- 5 -	-	Withdrawn on payment of costs.	-					
	C. S.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
	T. J. H.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
	F. M.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
	W. P.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
	E. T.	- 1 -	Paid.	-	-					
1871.	W. H. T.	- 5 -	Paid.	-	-					
	W. T. L.	- - -	-	No appearance. Settled.	-					

Year	Name	Age	Sex	Religion	Marital Status	Occupation	Address	Notes	Remarks	Signature
1873	S. B.	1	M							
	J. P.		M							
	J. T. T.		M							
	W. P.		M							
	T. B.		M							
	O. F.		M							
	J. B.		M							
	W. K.		M							
	J. B.		M							
	E. R.		M							
	M. B.		M							
	C. A. H.		M							
1874	None									
1872	J. L.		M							
	E. F.		M							
	E. K.		M							
1873	J. L.		M							
	H. T.		M							
	J. H. L.		M							
	J. W.		M							
	J. R.		M							
	W. N.		M							
1874	A. B.		M							
	F. R.		M							
	J. M.		M							
	G. J.		M							
	T. E.		M							
	F. S.		M							
	C. K.		M							
	J. R.		M							

Southampton, Borough and County of the Town

RETURN RELATING TO THE VACCINATION ACT, 1867.

RETURN of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
South Shields - - - - -	1871 - - - - -	T. B.	5 s. and costs.	-	-	-	£. s. d.	-	-
		J. C.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. T.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		R. G.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		W. T.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		E. C.	ditto.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stafford - - - - -	1872 - - - - -	M. M.	5 s. and costs.	-	-	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	1 - -	Yes	Yes, on payment - ditto.	J. G.	-	-	-
		J. C.	1 - -	Yes.	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. C.	1 - -	Yes.	ditto.	-	-	-	-
		J. O.	1 - -	Yes.	ditto.	T. C.	-	-	-
		T. O.	1 - -	No	-	A. J. W.	-	-	-
Stalybridge - - - - -	1870 - - - - -	T. C. K.	1 - -	No.	-	T. O.	1 - -	No.	-
		A. J. W.	1 - -	-	-	T. C. K.	1 - -	No.	-
		G. G.	5 - -	-	-	A. J. W.	1 - -	No.	-
		- None -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		P. D.	2 6	7 days.	Discharged.	-	-	-	-
		E. B.	1 - -	-	-	W. J. B.	1 12 6	Paid.	-
Stamford - - - - -	1871 - - - - -	J. S.	2 6	-	-	W. J. B.	1 3	Paid.	-
		M. R.	-	-	-	W. J. B., four cases	2 6 -	Paid.	-
		W. H.	-	-	-	A. E. E.	11 6	Paid.	-
		W. L.	2 6	-	-	J. R.	1 11 6	Paid.	-
		W. G.	5 - -	-	-	W. J. B., four cases	8 18 -	Paid.	-
		W. A.	10 - -	-	-	A. E. E.	1 14 -	Paid.	-
Stalybridge - - - - -	1872 - - - - -	- None -	-	-	-	J. R.	1 15 -	Paid.	-
		- None -	-	-	-	G. P. K.	1 14 -	Paid.	-
		- None -	-	-	-	E. C.	1 15 -	Paid.	-
		- None -	-	-	-	J. P.	1 14 -	Paid.	-
		- None -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		- None -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Swansea	1870	T. R. D. R. A. B. J. R. W. D.	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - - - -	- - -
---------	------	---	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-------------

Return of the Number of Prosecutions in respect of *England* and *Wales* since the 1st day of January 1870 to the 1st day of January 1875, under "The Vaccination Act, 1867," &c.—*contd.*

NAME OF BOROUGH, &c. PETTY SESSIONS.	Year.	Number of Persons Summoned under Section 29 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."				Number of Persons Summoned under Section 31 of "The Vaccination Act, 1867."			
		Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.	Name of Person.	Amount of Penalty inflicted on Conviction.	Whether Imprisoned in Default.	Whether Discharged.
Warrington - - - - - Wells, City and Borough - - - - - Wigan - - - - -	1874 -	J. B.	£. s. d. 10 s. and costs.	-	-	-	£. s. d. -	-	-
	1872 -	C. B. S.	- 2 6	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-
	1870 -	P. B.	1 - -	No	-	P. B.	1 - -	No.	Yes
	1871 -	A. J. W. H. K. P. H.	- 5 - 1 7 - 1 - -	No. No. Yes	-	A. J. W. H. K. P. H.	1 - - 1 - - 1 - -	No. No. Yes	- - Yes
	1872 -	P. H. L. B. T. H. W. H. K. A. J.	1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - -	Yes No. No. No. No.	- - - - -	P. H.	1 - -	Yes	Discharged; child not within the union. - Paid after commitment. - ditto.
	1873 -	None	-	-	-	W. H. K. A. J. L. B. W. H. K. W. H. K. W. H. K. W. H. K. A. J. A. J. A. J. W. H. K. W. H. K. L. B.	- 10 - - 10 - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - - 1 - -	No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No.	- - - - - - - - - - - - -
	1874 -	A. J.	1 - -	No	-	L. B.	1 - -	No.	-
	1870 -	G. R. W. T.	- - -	-	Yes Yes.	J. B.	- - -	-	Yes
	1871 -	C. W. J. P.	- 1 - - 1 -	- Paid. Paid.	-	-	-	-	-
Winchester, City - - - - -	1870 -	G. R. W. T.	- - -	-	Yes Yes.	J. B.	- - -	-	Yes
	1871 -	C. W. J. P.	- 1 - - 1 -	- Paid. Paid.	-	-	-	-	-
		On his paying the costs of the order, and promising to obey it.							

Discharged; child unfit at the time for vaccination in consequence of illness.

Parish	Year	J. T.	Costs	Discharged	Yes; paid costs	J. M.	Yes	Act complied with and paid costs.	
Wishet	1873	S.	-	-	-	A. S. N.	Yes	ditto.	
		E. T.	-	-	-	S. T.	Yes	ditto.	
		H. R.	-	-	-	W. S.	Yes	ditto.	
		C. A.	-	-	-	J. P.	Yes	ditto.	
Worcester	1874	None	-	-	-	N. W.	Yes	ditto.	
		J. C.	-	-	-	J. C.	Yes	ditto.	
		J. R.	-	-	-	D. F.	Yes	ditto.	
		J. S.	-	-	-	F. K.	Yes	ditto.	
		T. H. W.	-	-	-	- B.	Yes	ditto.	
		B. O.	-	-	-	W. O.	Yes	ditto.	
		E. H.	-	-	-	B. G.	Yes	Act complied with and paid costs.	
		J. S.	-	-	-	W. C. S.	Yes	ditto.	
		T. D.	-	-	-	W. C. S.	Yes	ditto.	
		J. W. P.	-	-	-	T. S.	Yes	ditto.	
		C. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Yarmouth, Great	1871-1873	J. C.	-	-	-	-	-
J. R.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
J. S.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
T. H. W.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
B. O.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
E. H.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
J. S.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
T. D.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
J. W. P.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
C. H.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
C. T. C.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
G. D. F.	-			-	-	-	-	-	
York	1871-1873	W. S. T.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		W. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		H. K.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		M. A. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		G. H.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		C. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		H. W.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. F.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		W. M.	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		J. S.	-	-	-	-	-	-	

